arXiv:1601.07236v3 [math.CA] 27 Jul 2016

MATRIX BIORTHOGONAL POLYNOMIALS IN THE UNIT CIRCLE: RIEMANN–HILBERT PROBLEM AND THE MATRIX DISCRETE PAINLEVÉ II SYSTEM

GIOVANNI A. CASSATELLA-CONTRA AND MANUEL MAÑAS

ABSTRACT. Matrix Szegő biorthogonal polynomials for quasi-definite matrices of measures are studied. For matrices of Hölder weights a Riemann–Hilbert problem is uniquely solved in terms of the matrix Szegő polynomials and its Cauchy transforms. The Riemann–Hilbert problem is given as an appropriate framework for the discussion of the Szegő matrix and the associated Szegő recursion relations for the matrix orthogonal polynomials and its Cauchy transforms. Pearson type differential systems characterizing the matrix of weights are studied. These are linear systems of ordinary differential equations which are required to be monodromy free. Linear ordinary differential equations for the matrix Szegő polynomials and its Cauchy transforms are derived. It is shown how these Pearson systems lead to nonlinear difference equations for the Verblunsky matrices and two examples, of Fuchsian and non-Fuchsian type, are considered. For both cases a new matrix version of the discrete Painlevé II equation for the Verblunsky matrices is found. Reductions of these matrix discrete Painlevé II systems presenting locality are discussed.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1
2. Matrix Szegő biorthogonal polynomials 4
2.1. Matrices of measures in the unit circle 4
2.2. Matrix Szegő polynomials on the unit circle 5
2.3. Symmetry properties 12
3. The Riemann-Hilbert problem 13
3.1. Cauchy transforms 13
3.2. Riemann–Hilbert problems 16
4. Recursion relations and systems of matrix linear ordinary differential equations 19
4.1. Recursion relations 20
4.2. Pearson equations for the matrix of weights and some of its consequences 25
5. The matrix discrete Painlevé II system 30
5.1. The Fuchsian case 31
5.2. The non-Fuchsian case 35
5.3. Discussion on the matrix discrete Painlevé II systems. Locality 39
Appendix A. Fuchsian examples of matrices of weights for $N = 2$ 43
References 48

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to explore the connection between the theory of integrable discrete equations of Painlevé type and the Riemann–Hilbert problem for matrix orthogonal polynomials. In the present

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14J70,15A23,33C45,37K10,37L60,42C05,46L55.

Key words and phrases. Szegő matrix biorthogonal polynomials, quasi-determinants, Cauchy transfoms, Riemann–Hilbert problem, recursion relations, generalized Pearson equations, monodromy free systems, Fuchsian and non-Fuchsian systems, matrix discrete Painlevé II sytems.

GCC benefited of the financial support of *Acción Especial Ref. AE1/13-18837* of the *Universidad Complutense de Madrid*. The research of MM has been supported by the grant MTM2015-65888-C4-3-P, *Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad*, Spain.

The authors acknowledge Prof. Piergiulio Tempesta for many illuminating conversations.

work, we shall extend the Riemann–Hilbert approach to the unit circle, for a class of biorthogonal polynomials of Szegő type defined in terms of a matrix of Hölder weights. With the aid of the Riemann–Hilbert problem we will find a matrix version of the discrete Painlevé II equations that holds for the Verblunsky matrices.

The unit circle is denoted by $\mathbb{T} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$, while its interior, the unit disk by $\mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ and its exterior by $\bar{\mathbb{D}} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$. Given complex Borel measure μ supported in $\mathbb{T}$ we say that is positive definite if it maps measurable sets into non-negative numbers, that in the absolutely continuous situation, with respect to the Lebesgue measure $\mathrm{d}\, m(\zeta) = \dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,\zeta}{2\pi \mathrm{i}\,\zeta}$, has the form $w(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\, m(\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, with the weight function $w(\zeta)$, integrable or Hölder, depending on the context. For the positive definite situation the orthogonal polynomials in the unit circle (OPUC) or Szegő polynomials are defined as those monic polynomials P_n of degree n that satisfy $\int_{\mathbb{T}} P_n(z) z^{-k}\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(z) = 0$, for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$, [113]. We refer the reader to Barry Simon's books [108] and [109] for a very detailed studied of OPUC, and for a survey on matrix orthogonal polynomials we refer the reader to [39].

Orthogonal polynomials on the real line (OPRL) supported in the interval $[-1, 1]$ and OPUC are deeply connected as has been shown in several papers, see [60, 23]. From the side of an spectral approach a study of the operator of multiplication by z is required, this analysis is associated to the existence of recursion relations. For OPRL the three term recurrence laws provide a tridiagonal matrix, the so called Jacobi operator, while for OPUC one is faced with a Hessenberg matrix, being a more involved scenario that the Jacobi one (as it is not a sparse matrix with a finite number of non vanishing diagonals). In fact, A better approach are Szegő recursion relation, which need of the reciprocal or reverse Szegő polynomials $\tilde{P}_l(z) := z^l \overline{P_l(\bar{z}^{-1})}$ and the reflection or Verblunsky coefficients $\alpha_l := P_l(0)$. Szegő recursion relations for for OPUC are

$$\begin{pmatrix} P_l(z) \\ \tilde{P}_l(z) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} z & \alpha_l \\ z\bar{\alpha}_l & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P_{l-1}(z) \\ \tilde{P}_{l-1}(z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The study of zeroes of OPUC has been a very active area, see for example [8, 14, 21, 61, 69, 71, 92, 99], and interesting applications to signal analysis theory [80, 81, 102, 103] have been found. Let us stress that in general Szegő polynomials do not provide a dense set in the Hilbert space $L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$; Szegő prove that for a nontrivial probability measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ with Verblunsky coefficients $\{\alpha_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ the corresponding Szegő's polynomials are dense in $L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$ if and only if $\prod_{n=0}^{\infty}(1 - |\alpha_n|^2) = 0$. This can be refined for an absolutely continuous probability measure, indeed the Kolmogorov's density theorem ensures that density of the OPUC in $L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$ happens if and only if the so called Szegő's condition $\int_{\mathbb{T}} \log\big(w(\theta)\big)\,\mathrm{d}\,\theta = -\infty$ is satisfied [112].

Toda integrable equations and OPUC are deeply bond. Adler and van Moerbeke studied such connections [7] and introduced the so called Toeplitz lattice. Golinskii [70] has studied some classes of reductions of the Toeplitz lattice connected with Schur flows for a measure invariant under conjugation, see [111] [54]) and [97]. The Toeplitz lattice is equivalent to the well known Ablowitz–Ladik lattice introduced in [3, 4]. The integrable structure of Schur flows and its connection with Ablowitz–Ladik was studied from a Hamiltonian point of view in [98], and other works also introduce connections with Laurent polynomials and τ-functions, like [55], [56] and [24].

The Cantero–Moral–Velázquez (CMV) [29] has great advantages when analyzing orthogonality in the unit circle. We need to replace polynomials wit Laurent polynomials (OLPUC) which are essentially equivalent to the original Szegő polynomials. For example, OLPUC are always dense in $L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$ this is not true in general for the OPUC, [27] and [38]. This bijection OLPUC-OPUC implies the replacement of the Szegő recursion relations with a five-term relations similar to the OPRL situation. Orthogonality in the unit circle has been studied from this new point of view in a number of papers, see for example [110, 82]. Alternative or generic orders for the CMV ordering can be found in [37]. Despite these facts, we must mention that he discovery of the advantages of the CMV ordering goes back to previous work [117]. The CMV ordering was used in [10] to study the relations between OLPUC and Toda theory.

In 1992, when studying 2D quantum gravity a Riemann-Hilbert problem was solved in terms of OPRL, [58]. Namely, it was found that the solution of a 2×2 Riemann–Hilbert problem can be expressed in terms of orthogonal polynomials in the real line and its Cauchy transforms. Deift and Zhou combined these ideas with a non-linear steepest descent analysis in a series of important works [43, 44, 46, 47] which as a

byproduct generated a large activity in the field. To mention just a few relevant results let us cite the study of strong asymptotic with applications in random matrix theory, [43, 45], the analysis of determinantal point processes [40, 41, 85, 86], orthogonal Laurent polynomials [88, 89] and Painlevé equations [79, 42]. For the case of OPUC, a Riemann–Hilbert problem was discussed in [20], see also [90, 91]. An excellent introduction, in the realm of integrable systems, of the Riemann Hilbert problem is given [78]. In the monograph we can find a modern account of the Painlevé equations and the Riemann–Hilbert or isomonodromy method. For a very good account of the very close theme of the 21rst Hilbert problem see [16]. For more on integrable systems, Painlevé equations and its discrete versions see [1, 2].

The study of equations for the recursion coefficients for OPRL or OPUC has been a subject of interest. The question of how the form of the weight and its properties, for example to satisfy a Pearson type equation, translates to the recursion coefficients has been treated in several places, a good review is [115]. It was in [59] were Géza Freud studied weights in $\mathbb{R}$ of exponential variation $w(x) = |x|^{\rho}\exp(-|x|^{m})$, $\rho > -1$ and $m > 0$. For $m = 2, 4, 6$ he constructed relations among them as well as determined its asymptotic behavior. However, Freud did not found the role of the discrete Painlevé I, that was discovered later by Magnus [87]. For the unit circle and a weight of the form $w(\theta) = \exp(k\cos\theta)$, $k \in \mathbb{R}$, Periwal and Shevitz [104, 105], in the context of matrix models, found the discrete Painlevé II equation for the recursion relations of the corresponding orthogonal polynomials. This result was rediscovered latter and connected with the Painlevé III equation [75]. In [19] the discrete Painlevé II was found using the Riemann–Hilbert problem given in [20], see also [114]. For a nice account of the relation of these discrete Painlevé equations and integrable systems see [36]. We also mention the recent paper [35] where a discussion on the relationship between the recurrence coefficients of orthogonal polynomials with respect to a semiclassical Laguerre weight and classical solutions of the fourth Painlevé equation can be found.

Back in 1949, Krein [83, 84] used orthogonal polynomials with matrix coefficients on the real line and thereafter were studied sporadically until the last decade of the XX century, being some relevant papers [22], [68] and [17]. For a kind of discrete Sturm–Liouville operators the scattering problem is solved in [17], finding that the polynomials that satisfy a relation of the form

$$xP_k(x) = A_kP_{k+1}(x) + B_kP_k(x) + A_{k-1}^{*}P_{k-1}(x), \qquad k = 0, 1, \ldots,$$

are orthogonal with respect to a positive definite measure; i.e., a matrix version of Favard's theorem. Then, in the 1990's and the 2000's it was found that matrix orthogonal polynomials (MOP) satisfy in some cases properties as do the classical orthogonal polynomials. For example, Laguerre, Hermite and Jacobi polynomials, i.e., the scalar-type Rodrigues' formula [48, 49] and a second order differential equation [50, 51, 26]. It has been proven [52] that operators of the form $D=\partial^2F_2(t)+\partial^1F_1(t)+\partial^0F_0$ have as eigenfunctions different infinite families of MOP's. A new family of MOP's satisfying second order differential equations whose coefficients do not behave asymptotically as the identity matrix was found in [26]; see also [30]. We have studied [9, 11] matrix extensions of the generalized polynomials studied in [5, 6]. Recently, in [12], we have extended the Christoffel transformation to MOPRL obtaining a new matrix Christoffel formula, and in [13] more general transformations –of Geronimus and Uvarov type– where also considered.

In [31] the Riemann–Hilbert problem for this matrix situation and the appearance of non-Abelian discrete versions of Painlevé I were explored, showing singularity confinement [32]. The singularity analysis for a matrix discrete version of the Painlevé I equation was performed. It was found that the singularity confinement holds generically, i.e. in the whole space of parameters except possibly for algebraic subvarieties. For an alternative discussion of the use of Riemann–Hilbert problem for MOPRL see [73]. Let us mention that in [93, 94] and [28] the MOP are expressed in terms of Schur complements that play the role of determinants in the standard scalar case. In [28] an study of matrix Szegő polynomials and the relation with a non Abelian Ablowitz–Ladik lattice is carried out, and in [18] the CMV ordering is applied to study orthogonal Laurent polynomials in the circle.

The layout of the paper is as follows. We start in §2 recalling some facts of measure theory in $\mathbb{T}$ and, in particular, we discuss matrices of measures in the unit circle. We then proceed with the construction of matrix Szegő polynomials in the quasi-definite scenario, we introduce reverse polynomials, their quasi-determinantal expressions, the Verblunsky coefficients and the Gauss–Borel factorization for the moment matrix, that leads to biorthogonal families of matrix polynomials. We also discuss some symmetry properties. In §3, following [33], we introduce in the first place the Cauchy transforms of the matrix orthogonal polynomials, and then discuss the Riemann–Hilbert problem in this more general context. Next, in §4 we

apply the Riemann–Hilbert problem to derive the Szegő recursion relations and some differential relations. We conclude the paper in §5 with the finding of a matrix discrete Painlevé II equation, which holds for the Verblunsky matrices whenever the matrix of weights has a right logarithmic derivative of certain form — of Fuchsian and non-Fuchsian singularity type— associated with a monodromy free system. This Pearson type equation for the matrix of weights allows us to avoid serious difficulties, that appear if one insists in deriving these matrix discrete Painlevé equations directly from explicit Freud's weights. Let us notice that these discrete Painlevé systems have non local terms, involving not only near neighbors. This issue is also consider and non trivial reductions that get rid of these non local contributions are presented. We also include, in Appendix A, some examples of matrices of weights, for the Fuchsian situation, constructed as solutions to the mentioned Pearson equations.

2. Matrix Szegő biorthogonal polynomials

In this section we consider the matrix extension of Szegő biorthogonal polynomials in the unit circle [113], see [28, 18].

2.1. **Matrices of measures in the unit circle.** We recall here some facts regarding measure theory on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$, we follow [106, 53, 33]. The Lebesgue measure, for $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, is

$$\mathrm{d}\, m(\zeta) := \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\zeta}{2\pi \mathrm{i}\,\zeta}.$$

We shall consider a matrix of finite complex valued Borel measures μ supported in $\mathbb{T}$, we denote the set of such measures by $\mathcal{B}$. A matrix of measures $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$ is said absolutely continuous, with respect to the Lebesgue measure m, written $\mu \ll m$, if $\mu(A) = 0_N$, where $0_N \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ denotes the zero matrix, for all Borel sets A of Lebesgue zero measure, $m(A) = 0$. A matrix of measures $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$ in singular, with respect to the Lebesgue measure m, written $\mu \perp m$, if for two disjoint Borel sets A, B such that $\mathbb{T} = A \cup B$ we have $\mu(A) = 0_N$ and $m(B) = 0$. Any matrix of measures $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$ can be decomposed uniquely $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s$, $\mu_a \ll m$ and $\mu_s \perp m$. As was proven by Radon and Nikodym a $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$ is absolutely continuous if and only if there exist a matrix $w : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ built up with $L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$ weights such that $\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta) = w(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\, m(\zeta)$, i.e.,

$$\mu(B) = \int_B w(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\, m(\zeta);$$

the matrix of weights $w(\zeta)$ is called the matrix of Radon–Nikodym derivatives and we write

$$w(\zeta) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mu}{\mathrm{d}\, m}(\zeta).$$

Therefore, according to the Lebesgue–Radon–Nikodym theorem [106, 53] for any matrix of measures $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$ and any Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{T}$ we can write

$$\mu(B) = \int_B \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mu}{\mathrm{d}\, m}(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\, m(\zeta) + \mu_s(B),$$

where, following [33], we have introduced the matrix of Radon–Nikodym derivatives of μ, $\mu = \mu_a + \mu_s$, with respect to the Lebesgue measure, as the matrix of Radon–Nikodym derivatives of its absolutely continuous component,

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mu}{\mathrm{d}\, m} := \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mu_a}{\mathrm{d}\, m}.$$

For any Borel measure we can consider its differential [106, 53, 33], let $I(\zeta, t)$ be the arc of the unit circle subtended by the points $\zeta e^{\mathrm{i}\,t}$ and $\zeta e^{-\mathrm{i}\,t}$ and consider, for $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$(\underline{D}\mu)(\zeta) := \liminf_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\mu(I(\zeta,t))}{m(I(\zeta,t))}, \qquad (\overline{D}\mu)(\zeta) := \limsup_{t\to 0^+} \frac{\mu(I(\zeta,t))}{m(I(\zeta,t))}.$$

When these two matrices are bounded and equal, $(\underline{D}\mu)(\zeta) = (\overline{D}\mu)(\zeta) =: (D\mu)(\zeta)$, we say that μ is differentiable (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) at $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ with matrix of differentials $D\mu(\zeta)$. Then,

see [106, 53, 33], $\mu \in \mathcal{B}$ is differentiable $\mathfrak{m}$-almost for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, moreover its matrix of differentials $D\mu \in \left(L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mu)\right)^{N\times N}$ is a matrix of integrable functions and for any Borel set B we have

$$\mu(B) = \int_B (D\mu)(\zeta)\, d\,\mathfrak{m}(\zeta) + \mu_s(B),$$

where $\mu_s \perp \mathfrak{m}$ and $D\mu_s(\zeta) = 0$ for $\mathfrak{m}$-almost every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. In this situation, the matrix of differentials and the matrix of Radon–Nikodym derivatives coincide, $(D\mu)(\zeta) = \dfrac{d\,\mu}{d\,\mathfrak{m}}(\zeta)$, for $\mathfrak{m}$-almost every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$.

2.2. **Matrix Szegő polynomials on the unit circle.** Here we follow [28] and [18].

Definition 1 (Szegő matrix polynomials)**.** *Given a matrix of measures μ, the left and right monic matrix Szegő polynomials $P^L_{1,n}(z)$, $P^R_{1,n}(z)$, $P^L_{2,n}(z)$, $P^R_{2,n}(z)$ are monic polynomials*

$$P^L_{1,n}(z) = P^L_{1,n,0} + \cdots + P^L_{1,n,n-1}z^{n-1} + I_N z^n, \qquad P^R_{1,n}(z) = P^R_{1,n,0} + \cdots + P^R_{1,n,n-1}z^{n-1} + I_N z^n,$$
$$P^L_{2,n}(z) = P^L_{2,n,0} + \cdots + P^L_{2,n,n-1}z^{n-1} + I_N z^n, \qquad P^R_{2,n}(z) = P^R_{2,n,0} + \cdots + P^R_{2,n,n-1}z^{n-1} + I_N z^n,$$

where $I_N \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ is the identity matrix and $P^L_{1,n,j}, P^R_{1,n,j}, P^L_{2,n,j}, P^R_{2,n,j} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$, such that the following orthogonality conditions

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} P^L_{1,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^j = 0_N, \tag{1}$$

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^j\, d\,\mu(\zeta) P^R_{1,n}(\zeta) = 0_N, \tag{2}$$

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \zeta^j\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\left(P^L_{2,n}(\zeta)\right)^\dagger = 0_N, \tag{3}$$

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \left(P^R_{2,n}(\zeta)\right)^\dagger d\,\mu(\zeta)\zeta^j = 0_N, \tag{4}$$

stand for all $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

From the second families of left and right Szegő matrix polynomials $P^L_{2,n}(z)$ and $P^R_{2,n}(z)$ we construct

Definition 2 (Reciprocal Szegő polynomials)**.** *The reciprocal (or reverse) left and right Szegő matrix polynomials $\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(z)$ and $\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z)$ are given by*

$$\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(z) := z^n\left(P^L_{2,n}\left(\bar{z}^{-1}\right)\right)^\dagger = I_N + \left(P^L_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger z + \cdots + \left(P^L_{2,n,0}\right)^\dagger z^n,$$
$$\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z) := z^n\left(P^R_{2,n}\left(\bar{z}^{-1}\right)\right)^\dagger = I_N + \left(P^R_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger z + \cdots + \left(P^R_{2,n,0}\right)^\dagger z^n.$$

Definition 3 (Verblunsky matrices)**.** *The Verblunsky matrices are the evaluations at the origin, $z = 0$, of the Szegő polynomials*

$$\alpha^L_{1,n} := P^L_{1,n}(0), \qquad \alpha^R_{1,n} := P^R_{1,n}(0), \qquad \alpha^L_{2,n} := P^L_{2,n}(0), \qquad \alpha^R_{2,n} := P^R_{2,n}(0).$$

Proposition 1. *In terms of the Verblunsky coefficients, the Szegő matrix polynomials of type 1 and its reciprocals can be written as follows*

$$P^L_{1,n}(z) = \alpha^L_{1,n} + \cdots + P^L_{1,n,n-1}z^{n-1} + I_N z^n, \qquad P^R_{1,n}(z) = \alpha^R_{1,n} + \cdots + P^R_{1,n,n-1}z^{n-1} + I_N z^n,$$
$$\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(z) = I_N + \left(P^L_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger z + \cdots + \left(\alpha^L_{2,n}\right)^\dagger z^n, \qquad \tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z) = I_N + \left(P^R_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger z + \cdots + \left(\alpha^R_{2,n}\right)^\dagger z^n.$$

Proposition 2. *The reciprocal Szegő matrix polynomials $\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(z)$ and $\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z)$ satisfy the following orthogonality relations*

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^j\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(\zeta) = 0_N, \tag{5}$$

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^j = 0_N. \tag{6}$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Proof. From (3) and (4) we get for $j \in \{0, \dots, n-1\}$.

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \zeta^{j-n} \, \mathrm{d}\, \mu(\zeta) \tilde{P}^{L}_{2,n}(\zeta) = 0_N, \qquad \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n}(\zeta) \, \mathrm{d}\, \mu(\zeta) \zeta^{j-n} = 0_N,$$

and relabeling the indexes we get the stated orthogonality relations. □

Following [18] we introduce

Definition 4. *The moments or Fourier coefficients* $\hat{\mu}(j) \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ *of the matrix of measures* μ *are defined by*

$$\hat{\mu}(j) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{j} \, \mathrm{d}\, \mu(\zeta),$$

with $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 5. *We introduce the left and right semi-infinite moment matrices*

$$\mathcal{M}^{L} := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{M}^{R} := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots \end{pmatrix},$$

and its truncations

$$\mathcal{M}^{L}_{[n]} := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{M}^{R}_{[n]} := \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrix of measures $\mathrm{d}\, \mu(\zeta)$ *is quasi-definite if* $\det \mathcal{M}^{L}_{[n]} \neq 0$ *and* $\det \mathcal{M}^{R}_{[n]} \neq 0$ *for all* $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

Observe that these truncated moment matrices are block Toeplitz matrices organized by block diagonals. We now need of the notion of quasi-determinant, see [67, 66, 65, 101].

Proposition 3. *The matrix of measures* μ *is quasi-definite if the last quasi-determinants* $\Theta_* M^{L}_{[n]}$ *and* $\Theta_* M^{R}_{[n]}$ *are not singular matrices.*

Proposition 4. *The Szegő matrix polynomials exists whenever the matrix of measures* μ *in quasi-definite. Moreover, they can be expressed in terms of last quasi-determinants of bordered truncated moment matrices*

$$P^{L}_{1,n}(z) = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) & I_N \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & I_N z \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & I_N z^2 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) & I_N z^{n-1} \\ \hat{\mu}(-n) & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-1) & I_N z^n \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P^{R}_{1,n}(z) = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) \\ I_N & I_N z & I_N z^2 & \dots & I_N z^{n-1} & I_N z^n \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\left(P^{L}_{2,n}(z)\right)^{\dagger} = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \hat{\mu}(3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(n) \\ I_N & I_N \bar{z} & I_N \bar{z}^2 & \cdots & I_N \bar{z}^{n-1} & I_N \bar{z}^n \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\left(P^{R}_{2,n}(z)\right)^{\dagger} = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) & I_N \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & I_N \bar{z} \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & I_N \bar{z}^2 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) & I_N \bar{z}^{n-1} \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n) & I_N \bar{z}^n \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. In terms of moments of the matrix of measures the orthogonality relations (1) and (2) read

$$(P^{L}_{1,n,0}, \dots, P^{L}_{1,n,n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix} = -(\hat{\mu}(-n), \dots, \hat{\mu}(-1)),$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P^{R}_{1,n,0} \\ \vdots \\ P^{R}_{1,n,n-1} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(-n) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) \end{pmatrix},$$

while orthogonality relations (3) and (4) read

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \left(P^L_{2,n,0}\right)^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ \left(P^L_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(1) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(n) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\left(\left(P^R_{2,n,0}\right)^\dagger, \ldots, \left(P^R_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger\right) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix} = -(\hat{\mu}(1), \ldots, \hat{\mu}(n)).$$

Thus, assuming the quasi-definite condition we get

$$(P^L_{1,n,0}, \ldots, P^L_{1,n,n-1}) = -(\hat{\mu}(-n), \ldots, \hat{\mu}(-1)) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1},$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} P^R_{1,n,0} \\ \vdots \\ P^R_{1,n,n-1} \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(-n) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \left(P^L_{2,n,0}\right)^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ \left(P^L_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(1) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(n) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\left(\left(P^R_{2,n,0}\right)^\dagger, \ldots, \left(P^R_{2,n,n-1}\right)^\dagger\right) = -(\hat{\mu}(1), \ldots, \hat{\mu}(n)) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1}.$$

Therefore, for the first family of left Szegő matrix polynomials we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{L}_{1,n}(z) &= I_N z^n + (P^{L}_{1,n,0},\dots,P^{L}_{1,n,n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} I_N \\ \vdots \\ I_N z^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= I_N z^n - (\hat{\mu}(-n),\dots,\hat{\mu}(-1)) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I_N \\ \vdots \\ I_N z^{n-1} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

while for the first family of right Szegő polynomials we find

$$\begin{aligned}
P^{R}_{1,n}(z) &= I_N z^n + (I_N,\dots,I_N z^{n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} P^{R}_{1,n,0} \\ \vdots \\ P^{R}_{1,n,n-1} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= I_N z^n - (I_N,\dots,I_N z^{n-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(-n) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the second family of left Szegő matrix polynomials we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(P^{L}_{2,n}(z)\big)^{\dagger} &= \bar{z}^n I_N + \big(1,\dots,\bar{z}^{n-1}\big) \begin{pmatrix} \big(P^{L}_{2,n,0}\big)^{\dagger} \\ \vdots \\ \big(P^{L}_{2,n,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \bar{z}^n I_N - \big(I_N,\dots,I_N\bar{z}^{n-1}\big) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(1) \\ \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(n) \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

while for the second family of right Szegő matrix polynomials we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\big(P^{R}_{2,n}(z)\big)^{\dagger} &= \bar{z}^n I_N + \Big(\big(P^{R}_{2,n,0}\big)^{\dagger},\dots,\big(P^{R}_{2,n,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big) \begin{pmatrix} I_N \\ \vdots \\ I_N\bar{z}^{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \bar{z}^n I_N - (\hat{\mu}(1),\dots,\hat{\mu}(n)) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} I_N \\ \vdots \\ I_N\bar{z}^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

From these relations the quasi-determinantal expressions follow immediately. □

Observe that this result is just informing us that the Szegő matrix polynomials can be expressed as *rational* functions of the moments. For example,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,1}(z) &= \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z \end{pmatrix} \\
&= -\hat{\mu}(-1)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1} + \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z, \\
\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,2}(z) &= \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^2 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= -\hat{\mu}(-2)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1} + \big(\hat{\mu}(-1) + \hat{\mu}(-2)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1}\hat{\mu}(1)\big)\big(\hat{\mu}(0) - \hat{\mu}(-1)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1}\hat{\mu}(1)\big)^{-1}\hat{\mu}(-1)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1} \\
&\qquad - \big(\hat{\mu}(-1) + \hat{\mu}(-2)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1}\hat{\mu}(1)\big)\big(\hat{\mu}(0) - \hat{\mu}(-1)(\hat{\mu}(0))^{-1}\hat{\mu}(1)\big)^{-1} z + \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In fact, they are polynomials in the moments and the inverses of the last quasi-determinants $\Theta_* \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{L}}_{[n]}$ and $\Theta_* \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{R}}_{[n]}$.

These expressions allow us to find

Proposition 5. *The reciprocal Szegő polynomials have the following quasi-determinantal expressions*

$$\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{L}}_{2,n}(z) = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \hat{\mu}(3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(n) \\ \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^n & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^{n-1} & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^{n-2} & \cdots & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z) = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^n \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^{n-1} \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^{n-2} \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n) & \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} \end{pmatrix}$$

Definition 6. *The Gauss–Borel factorization of the moments matrices is*

$$\mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{L}} = (\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{L}}_1)^{-1}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{L}}_2)^{-\dagger}, \qquad \mathcal{M}^{\mathrm{R}} = (\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{R}}_2)^{-1}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{R}}_1)^{-\dagger}, \tag{7}$$

where $\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{L}}_1, \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{L}}_2, \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{R}}_1, \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{R}}_2$ are lower unitriangular block semi-infinite matrices and H^{L} and H^{R} are block diagonal matrices.

Proposition 6. *The Gauss–Borel factorization can be performed when the the matrix of measures μ is quasi-definite.*

Proof. Follows the proof of Proposition 1 of [18] by replacing the moments matrices there by our moment matrices. □

Definition 7. *We introduce the semi-infinite vector of monomials*

$$\chi(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} \\ \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z \\ \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} z^2 \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix},$$

and the semi-infinite vectors of polynomials

$$\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_1(z) := \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{L}}_1\chi(z), \qquad \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_2(z) := \mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{L}}_2\chi(z), \qquad (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{R}}_1(z))^\top := (\chi(z))^\top(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{R}}_1)^\dagger, \qquad (\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{R}}_2(z))^\top := (\chi(z))^\top(\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{R}}_2)^\dagger.$$

Proposition 7. *The moment matrices can be written as follows*

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{L}} = \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \chi(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)(\chi(\zeta))^\dagger, \qquad \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{R}} = \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \left((\chi(\zeta))^\top\right)^\dagger \mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)(\chi(\zeta))^\top.$$

Proposition 8. *We have the biothogonality relations*

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} P_1^L(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\big(P_2^L(\zeta)\big)^\dagger = H^L, \tag{8}$$

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \big((P_2^R(\zeta))^\top\big)^\dagger\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\big(P_1^R(\zeta)\big)^\top = H^R. \tag{9}$$

Proof. To prove (8) we just notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\oint_{\mathbb{T}} P_1^L(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\big(P_2^L(\zeta)\big)^\dagger &= S_1^L \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \chi(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\big(\chi(\zeta)\big)^\dagger (S_2^L)^\dagger\\ &= S_1^L M^L (S_2^L)^\dagger\\ &= H^L \qquad \text{use (7).}\end{aligned}$$

Now for (9)

$$\begin{aligned}\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \big((P_2^R(\zeta))^\top\big)^\dagger\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\big(P_1^R(\zeta)\big)^\top &= S_2^R \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \big((\chi(\zeta))^\top\big)^\dagger\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)(\chi(\zeta))^\top (S_1^R)^\dagger\\ &= S_2^R M^R (S_1^R)^\dagger\\ &= H^R \qquad \text{use (7).}\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 9. *The components* $P_{1,n}^L$, $P_{1,n}^R$, $P_{2,n}^L$ *and* $P_{2.n}^R$ *of the semi-infinite vectors* P_1^L, P_1^R, P_2^L *and* P_2^R

(1) *Satisfy the biorthogonal relations*

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} P_{1,n}^L(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\big(P_{2,m}^L(\zeta)\big)^\dagger = H_n^L\delta_{n,m}, \qquad \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \big(P_{2,m}^R(\zeta)\big)^\dagger\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)P_{1,n}^R(\zeta) = H_n^R\delta_{n,m}. \tag{10}$$

(2) *The components* $P_{1,n}^L$, $P_{1,n}^R$, $P_{2,n}^L$ *and* $P_{2.n}^R$ *of the semi-infinite vectors* P_1^L, P_1^R, P_2^L *and* P_2^R *are the Szegő matrix polynomials of Definition 1.*

(3) *The Szegő polynomials and its reciprocals satisfy*

$$\oint_{\mathbb{T}} P_{1,n}^L(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^m\tilde{P}_{2,m}^L(\zeta) = H_n^L\delta_{n,m}, \qquad \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^m\tilde{P}_{2,m}^L(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)P_{1,n}^R(\zeta) = H_n^R\delta_{n,m}. \tag{11}$$

(4) *The quasi-tau functions can be expressed as*

$$H_n^L = \oint_{\mathbb{T}} P_{1,n}^L(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n \tag{12}$$

$$= \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)\tilde{P}_{2,n}^L(\zeta), \tag{13}$$

$$H_n^R = \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^n\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)P_{1,n}^R(\zeta) \tag{14}$$

$$= \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{P}_{2,n}^R(\zeta)\,\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta). \tag{15}$$

Proof. (1) Elementary.
(2) Observe that (10) implies the orthogonal relations (1), (2), (3) and (4).
(3) Use Definition 2.
(4) It follows from (10) and (11).

□

Definition 8. *The matrices* H_N^L *and* H_n^R *are called quasi-tau matrices.*

Proposition 10. *The quasi-tau matrices must be not singular and have the following last quasi-determinantal expressions*

$$H_n^L = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(-2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(-n+1) \\ \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) \\ \hat{\mu}(2) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(n-1) & \hat{\mu}(n-2) & \hat{\mu}(n-3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix},$$

$$H_n^R = \Theta_* \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & \hat{\mu}(2) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(n-1) \\ \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \hat{\mu}(1) & & \hat{\mu}(n-2) \\ \hat{\mu}(-2) & \hat{\mu}(-1) & \hat{\mu}(0) & \ddots & \hat{\mu}(n-3) \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & \\ \hat{\mu}(-n+1) & \hat{\mu}(-n+2) & \hat{\mu}(-n+3) & \cdots & \hat{\mu}(0) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows from the Gaussian factorization, see [101, 18, 28]. □

2.3. **Symmetry properties.**

Proposition 11. *Assume that there is a matrix* $C \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ *such that*

$$[C, \mu] = 0.$$

Then, the matrix C *commute with all the moments* $\hat{\mu}(n)$*, i.e.,*

$$[C, \hat{\mu}(n)] = 0, \qquad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

and with the Szegő matrix polynomials, reciprocals, corresponding Verblunsky coefficients and quasi-tau matrices

$$[C, P_{1,n}^L(z)] = [C, P_{1,n}^R(z)] = \left[C, \tilde{P}_{2,n}^L(z)\right] = \left[C, \tilde{P}_{2,n}^R(z)\right] = 0,$$
$$[C, \alpha_{1,n}^L] = [C, \alpha_{1,n}^R] = [C, \left(\alpha_{2,n}^L\right)^\dagger] = [C, \left(\alpha_{2,n}^R\right)^\dagger] = 0,$$
$$[C, H_n^L] = [C, H_n^R].$$

for all $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ *and* $z \in \mathbb{C}$*.*

Proof. It is obvious that C commutes with the moments. Then, as Proposition 4 ensures that Szegő matrix polynomials , $P_{1,n}^L(z)$ and $P_{1,n}^R(z)$ are rational functions of the moments, and Proposition 5 ensures the same for the reciprocal polynomials $\tilde{P}_{2,n}^L(z)$ and $\tilde{P}_{2,n}^R(z)$, we see that C commutes with then. The result for the Verblunsky coefficients follow immediately. The property regarding the quasi-tau matrices is deduced from Proposition 10. □

Proposition 12. *Suppose that for each pair of Borel sets* $A, B \subset \mathbb{T}$ *we have*

$$[\mu(A), \mu(B)] = 0.$$

Then, the set of the moments $\mathbb{C}\{\hat{\mu}(n)\}_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}$ *is an Abelian algebra*

$$[\hat{\mu}(i), \hat{\mu}(j)] = 0, \qquad i, j \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Moreover, the family of matrix polynomials

$$\left\{P_{1,n}^L(z_1), P_{1,n}^R(z_2), \tilde{P}_{2,n}^L(z_3), \tilde{P}_{2,n}^R(z_4)\right\}_{\substack{n\in\{0,1,2,\dots\} \\ z_1,z_2,z_3,z_4\in\mathbb{C}}}$$

is Abelian. Analogously, the set of Verblunsky matrices and quasi-tau matrices

$$\left\{\alpha_{1,n}^L, \alpha_{1,n}^R\left(\alpha_{2,n}^L\right)^\dagger, \left(\alpha_{2,n}^R\right)^\dagger, H_n^L, H_n^R\right\}_{n=0}^\infty$$

is Abelian.

Proof. For simplicity we give the proof for the absolutely continuous case, i.e., we assume that $\mu = w\,\mathrm{d}\,\mathfrak{m}$ with

$$[w(u), w(v)] = 0, \qquad \forall u, v \in \operatorname{supp}(w(z)) \subset \mathbb{T}.$$

First, we see that the moments commute among then. Indeed, according to Definition 4

$$\begin{aligned}[\hat{\mu}(i), \hat{\mu}(j)] &= \left[\oint_{\mathbb{T}} w(u) u^{-i} \frac{\mathrm{d}\,u}{2\pi\,\mathrm{i}\,u}, \oint_{\mathbb{T}} w(v) v^{-j} \frac{\mathrm{d}\,v}{2\pi\,\mathrm{i}\,v} \right] \\ &= -\oiint_{\mathbb{T}^2} [w(u), w(v)] u^{-i} v^{-j} \frac{\mathrm{d}u\,\mathrm{d}\,v}{4\pi^2 uv} \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

As in the previous proof Proposition 4 ensures that , $P^{L}_{1,n}(z)$ and $P^{R}_{1,n}(z)$ are rational functions of the moments, and Proposition 5 the same for the reciprocal polynomials $\tilde{P}^{L}_{2,n}(z)$ and $\tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n}(z)$, and the commutativity property follows. The result for the Verblunsky coefficients follow immediately. From Proposition 10 we deduce the commutativity with the quasi-tau matrices. □

3. The Riemann-Hilbert problem

In this section, following the seminal paper [58] we find a general Riemann-Hilbert problem whose solution characterizes matrix Szegő polynomials. This problem constitute the keystone for the finding of the matrix discrete Painlevé II system.

3.1. **Cauchy transforms.**

We began we some facts regarding Cauchy transforms for matrices of measures on the unit circle, we follow the excellent monograph [33].

Definition 9. *Given a finite Borel matrix of measures μ on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$ its Cauchy transform is defined by*

$$(C\mu)(z) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mu(\zeta)}{1 - \bar{\zeta} z},$$

where the integration along $\mathbb{T}$ is taken counterclockwise. We denote by $(C\mu)_+$ the restriction to the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ and by $(C\mu)_-$ the restriction to the annulus $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

Let us review some properties of the Cauchy transform that are relevant for this paper.

Properties of the Cauchy transform.

(1) The Cauchy transform $(C\mu)(z)$ is analytic on $\bar{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \mathbb{T}$, where $\bar{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$, with analytic continuation across the complement of $\operatorname{supp}(\mu)$.

(2) The restriction of the Cauchy transform $(C\mu)_- \in \cap_{0<p<1} H^p(\bar{\mathbb{D}})$, where $H^p(\bar{\mathbb{D}})$ is the Hardy space of the exterior of the unit circle.[1]

(3) We have $\|(C\mu)_+\|_{H^p(\bar{\mathbb{D}})} = O\big((1-p)^{-1}\big)$ for $p \to 1^-$, and consequently has exterior non-tangential limits almost everywhere on $\mathbb{T}$.

(4) The Taylor series of $(C\mu)_+$ at $z = 0$ is

$$(C\mu)_+(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(n) z^n, \qquad \forall z \in \mathbb{D},$$

and of $(C\mu)_-$ about the point of infinity is

$$(C\mu)_- = -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(-n) z^{-n}, \qquad \forall z \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}.$$

(5) For almost every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ the limits

$$(C\mu)_+(\zeta) = \lim_{r \to 1^-} (C\mu)_+(r\zeta), \qquad (C\mu)_-(\zeta) = \lim_{r \to 1^-} (C\mu)_+(\zeta/r),$$

exist.

[1] We understand that $f(z) \in H^p(\bar{\mathbb{D}})$ iff $f(z^{-1}) \in H^p(\mathbb{D})$. The Hardy space $H^p(\mathbb{D})$ contains all analytic functions $f(z)$ on $\mathbb{D}$ such that $\sup_{0<r<1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}} |f(r\zeta)|^p \,\mathrm{d}\,\mathfrak{m}(\zeta) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \infty$.

(6) The Fatou's jump

$$(C\mu)_+(\zeta) - (C\mu)_-(\zeta) = \frac{d\,\mu}{d\,m}(\zeta)$$

holds m-almost every[2], $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$.

(7) Privalov's theorem: for m-almost every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$PV \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\xi)}{1-\bar{\xi}\zeta} = \frac{1}{2}((C\mu)_+(\zeta) + (C\mu)_-(\zeta)).$$

Here the principal value at $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ is defined as

$$PV \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\xi)}{1-\bar{\xi}\zeta} := \lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+} \int_{|\xi-\zeta|>\epsilon} \frac{d\,\mu(\xi)}{1-\bar{\xi}\zeta},$$

whenever the limit exists.

The results of Privalov and Fatou are extensions of the Sokhotski–Plemelj formulas, first discussed by Sokhotski in 1873 for $d\,\mu(\zeta) = w(\zeta)\,d\,m(\zeta)$ where $w(\zeta)$ is a Lipschitz function and then refined by Plemelj in 1908. Privalov results goes back to 1919. We are now prepared to introduce the Cauchy transform according to the matrix of measures μ of the Szegő polynomials and their reciprocals.

Definition 10 (Cauchy transforms)**.** *We consider the following matrix Cauchy transforms of the Szegő matrix polynomials*

$$Q^L_{1,n}(z) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^n P^L_{1,n}(\zeta)\frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z}, \qquad Q^L_{2,n}(z) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z}\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n+1},$$
$$Q^R_{1,n}(z) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z}P^R_{1,n}(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n, \qquad Q^R_{2,n}(z) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{n+1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(\zeta)\frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z}.$$

Observe that

$$Q^L_{1,0}(z) = Q^R_{1,0}(z) = \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} = \begin{cases} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(n)z^n, & z \in \mathbb{D}, \\ -\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(-n)z^{-n}, & z \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

in terms of the Fourier coefficients.[3] Now, observing that

$$\frac{\bar{\zeta}}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} = z^{-1}\Big(\frac{1}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} - 1\Big)$$

we get

$$Q^L_{2,0}(z) = Q^R_{2,0}(z) = \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z}\bar{\zeta}$$
$$= z^{-1}\Big(\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} - \mu(\mathbb{T})\Big).$$

[2]With respect to the Lebesgue measure $m(\zeta)$.

[3]Notice that for m-almost every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ the Fatou's jump take place

$$\frac{d\,\mu}{d\,m}(\zeta) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(n)\zeta^n,$$

which is the Fourier series of the measure, and the Privalov's principal value holds:

$$PV \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{d\,\mu(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} = \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(n)\zeta^n - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \hat{\mu}(-n)\zeta^{-n}\Big).$$

Definition 11. *We will use the following Fourier coefficients*

$$\hat{P}^L_{1,n}(j) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} P^L_{1,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{-j}, \qquad \hat{P}^L_{2,n}(j) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{-j+1}\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(\zeta),$$
$$\hat{P}^R_{1,n}(j) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{-j}\, d\,\mu(\zeta)P^R_{1,n}(\zeta), \qquad \hat{P}^R_{2,n}(j) := \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{-j+1},$$

for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proposition 13. (1) *We have the following cancellations*

$$\hat{P}^L_{1,n}(j) = \hat{P}^L_{2,n}(j) = \hat{P}^R_{1,n}(j) = \hat{P}^R_{2,n}(j) = 0, \qquad j \in \{0, -1, , \dots, -n+1\}.$$

(2) *The quasi-tau matrices are*

$$H^L_n = \hat{P}^L_{1,n}(-n) = \hat{P}^L_{2,n}(1), \qquad H^R_n = \hat{P}^R_{1,n}(-n) = \hat{P}^R_{2,n}(1).$$

Proof. (1) Observe that (1), (2), (5) and (6) are equivalent to these cancellations.
(2) A simple consequence of(14),(12), (13) and (15).

□

Proposition 14 (Power series of the Cauchy transforms)**.** *The following Taylor series of the Cauchy transforms*

$$Q^L_{1,n}(z) = H^L_n + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{P}^L_{1,n}(-n-j)z^j, \qquad Q^L_{2,n}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hat{P}^L_{2,n}(-n-j)z^j,$$
$$Q^R_{1,n}(z) = H^R_n + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{P}^R_{1,n}(-n-j)z^j, \qquad Q^R_{2,n}(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \hat{P}^R_{2,n}(-n-j)z^j,$$

converge on $\mathbb{D}$ *. The following Taylor series about infinity*

$$Q^L_{1,n}(z) = -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{P}^L_{1,n}(j)z^{-n-j}, \qquad Q^L_{2,n}(z) = -H^L_n z^{-n-1} - \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \hat{P}^L_{2,n}(j)z^{-n-j},$$
$$Q^R_{1,n}(z) = -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \hat{P}^R_{1,n}(j)z^{-n-j}, \qquad Q^R_{2,n}(z) = -H^R_n z^{-n-1} - \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \hat{P}^R_{2,n}(j)z^{-n-j},$$

converge in $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

Proof. First we recall that

$$\bar{\zeta}^n \frac{1}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} = \bar{\zeta}^n + z\bar{\zeta}^{n+1} + z^2\bar{\zeta}^{n+2} + z^3\bar{\zeta}^{n+3} - \cdots, \qquad |z| < 1, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{T},$$

uniformly, from where we get the Taylor series in the unit disk.

For the Taylor expansions at infinity we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\zeta}^n \frac{1}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} &= -\bar{\zeta}^{n-1}z^{-1}\frac{1}{1-z^{-1}\bar{\zeta}^{-1}} \\ &= -z^{-1}\bar{\zeta}^{n-1} - z^{-2}\bar{\zeta}^{n-2} - z^{-3}\bar{\zeta}^{n-3} - \cdots, \qquad |z| > 1, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{T},\end{aligned}$$

uniformly. Then,

$$Q^L_{1,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} P^L_{1,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n-j}, \qquad Q^L_{2,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{n-j+1}\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\tilde{P}^L_{2,n}(\zeta),$$
$$Q^R_{1,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{n-j}\, d\,\mu(\zeta)P^R_{1,n}(\zeta), \qquad Q^R_{2,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n-j+1},$$

and consequently, recalling the orthogonal relations (1), (2), (5) and (6), we get

$$Q^{L}_{1,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} P^{L}_{1,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n-j}, \qquad Q^{L}_{2,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{n-j+1}\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\tilde{P}^{L}_{2,n}(\zeta),$$

$$Q^{R}_{1,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \bar{\zeta}^{n-j}\, d\,\mu(\zeta)P^{R}_{1,n}(\zeta), \qquad Q^{R}_{2,n}(z) := -\sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} z^{-j} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n}(\zeta)\, d\,\mu(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n-j+1},$$

and the result follows. □

Proposition 15 (Fatou's jump formulæ)**.** *The Cauchy transforms have the following jumps* $\mathfrak{m}$*-almost every* $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$

$$(Q^{L}_{1,n})_+(\zeta) - (Q^{L}_{1,n})_-(\zeta) = \bar{\zeta}^{n} P^{L}_{1,n}(\zeta)\frac{d\,\mu}{d\,\mathfrak{m}}(\zeta), \qquad (Q^{L}_{2,n})_+(\zeta) - (Q^{L}_{2,n})_-(\zeta) = \frac{d\,\mu}{d\,\mathfrak{m}}(\zeta)\tilde{P}^{L}_{2,n}(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n+1},$$

$$(Q^{R}_{1,n})_+(\zeta) - (Q^{R}_{1,n})_-(\zeta) = \frac{d\,\mu}{d\,\mathfrak{m}}(\zeta)P^{R}_{1,n}(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{n}, \qquad (Q^{R}_{2,n})_+(\zeta) - (Q^{R}_{2,n})_-(\zeta) = \bar{\zeta}^{n+1}\tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n}(\zeta)\frac{d\,\mu}{d\,\mathfrak{m}}(\zeta).$$

3.2. **Riemann–Hilbert problems.** Inspired by the seminal paper [58] and following the implementation for scalar Szegő polynomials given in [20], see also [90, 91], here we propose a block type Riemann–Hilbert problem in the unit circle and find its solution in terms of matrix Szegő polynomials. We start with a general situation, the weak problem, with integrable jump functions and then move to the more classical scenario, the strong problem, with Hölder jump functions.

Definition 12 (Weak and strong Riemann–Hilbert problems)**.** *The Riemann–Hilbert problem (RHP) consists in the finding of a* $2N \times 2N$ *matrix function,* $Y_n(z) \in \mathbb{C}^{2N\times 2N}$*, for a given* $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$*, such that*

(1) *Is analytic in* $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{T}$*.*
(2) *Satisfies the jump condition at* $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$

$$(Y_n)_+(\zeta) = (Y_n)_-(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{-n} \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix},$$

where $w = (w_{i,j})$ *is a matrix of weights. In the weak RHP we have* $w_{i,j} \in L^1$ *and request the jump to hold* $\mathfrak{m}$*-almost every* $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$*. In the strong RHP the weights* $w_{i,j}$ *are Hölder*[4] *and the jump must hold for all* $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$*.*
(3) *About infinity has the following asymptotic*

$$Y_n(z) = (I_{2N} + O(z^{-1}))\begin{pmatrix} I_N z^n & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-n} \end{pmatrix}, \qquad |z| \to \infty.$$

We have the following result

Theorem 1. *A solution of the Riemann-Hilbert problem stated in Definition 12 is given by the block matrix function*

$$Y_n(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P^{L}_{1,n}(z) & Q^{L}_{1,n}(z) \\ -\left(H^{R}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n-1}(z) & -\left(H^{R}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}Q^{R}_{2,n-1}(z) \end{pmatrix}, \qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}, \tag{17}$$

and

$$Y_0(z) := \begin{pmatrix} I_N & Q^{L}_{1,0}(z) \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix}. \tag{18}$$

For the weak RH problem the measure μ*, involved in the Szegő polynomials and the Cauchy transform, is taken such that its Radon–Nikodym derivative is the matrix of weights* $w = \frac{d\,\mu}{d\,\mathfrak{m}}$*. For the strong RH problem the measure is* $d\,\mu = w\, d\,\mathfrak{m}$ *and the solution is unique.*

Proof. Let us show that the matrix given in (17) is a solution of the RHP. We do it in three steps:

(1) The polynomials $P^{L}_{1,n}(z)$ and $\tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n-1}(z)$ are analytic functions in $\mathbb{C}$ and the Cauchy transforms $Q^{L}_{1,n}(z)$ and $Q^{R}_{2,n-1}(z)$ are analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{T}$. Therefore, $Y_n(z)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{T}$.

[4] A function $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$ is said Hölder if $|f(\zeta_1) - f(\zeta_2)| \leqslant M|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2|^{\alpha}$ for $M > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leqslant 1$, see [96].

(2) From Proposition 14 we can deduce the following asymptotics

$$Y_n(z) = \begin{pmatrix} I_N z^n + O(z^{n-1}) & O(z^{-n-1}) \\ O(z^{n-1}) & I_N z^{-n} + O(z^{-n-1}) \end{pmatrix} = (I_{2N} + O(z^{-1})) \begin{pmatrix} I_N z^n & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-n} \end{pmatrix}.$$

(3) For the weak RHP, Proposition 15 gives

$$\begin{aligned} \big(Y_n\big)_+(\zeta) - \big(Y_n\big)_-(\zeta) &= \begin{pmatrix} \big(P^L_{1,n}\big)_+(\zeta) - \big(P^L_{1,n}\big)_-(\zeta) & \big(Q^L_{1,n}\big)_+(\zeta) - \big(Q^L_{1,n}\big)_-(\zeta) \\ \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\Big(\big(P^R_{2,n-1}\big)_+(\zeta) - \big(P^R_{2,n-1}\big)_-(\zeta)\Big) & -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\Big(\big(Q^R_{2,n-1}\big)_+(\zeta) - \big(Q^R_{2,n-1}\big)_-(\zeta)\Big) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0_N & P^L_{1,n}(\zeta) w(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^n \\ 0_N & \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1} \tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(\zeta) w(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^n \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \big(Y_n\big)_-(\zeta) \begin{pmatrix} 0_N & w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

for m-almost every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. When we consider the strong RH situation then the matrix of weights is Hölder and the Sokhotski–Plemelj holds for every $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, see [64].

Once we have proven the existence of a solution to the Riemann–Hilbert problem, let us show its uniqueness for the strong RHP. We notice that $\det Y_n(z)$ is an analytic function in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{T}$, and has jump at $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, indeed

$$\begin{aligned} \det(Y_n)_+(\zeta) &= \det(Y_n)_-(\zeta) \begin{vmatrix} I_N & w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n \\ 0_N & I_N \end{vmatrix} \\ &= \det(Y_n)_-(\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\det Y_n(z)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}$, and the Liouville theorem ensures that is constant, but $\det Y_n \to 1$ as $|z| \to \infty$, consequently, we have that $\det Y_n(z) = 1$.[5] Thus, $(Y_n(z))^{-1}$ is a matrix of analytic functions for all $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{T}$. Given two solutions $\hat{Y}_n, Y_n$ to the Riemann–Hilbert problem, the block matrix $\hat{Y}_n \big(Y_n\big)^{-1}$ has no jump at $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, and therefore is analytic in the whole complex plane, thus is a constant matrix, and the asymptotic implies that this constant is the identity. □

As we have seen, the non uniqueness in the weak case is related to the weak Fatou jump corollary, that holds only almost everywhere in the circle, allowing therefore for singularities. Moreover, if the weak situation the matrix of $L^1(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$ weights only fixes the absolutely continuous part of the measure $\mu_a = w\, dm \ll m$, and we have the freedom of adding any singular measure $\mu_s \perp m$ as $D\mu_s = 0$. Therefore, given Y_n constructed for $w\, dm$ we may consider $\tilde{Y}_n$ associated with $w\, dm + \mu_s$ and we will have another solution to the weak RHP. For the strong RHP we refer the reader to [64], observe that in this situation the Lebesgue integration coincides with the Riemann integration.

From hereon we consider only the strong RH problem.

Definition 13. *We define the block matrix*

$$X_n(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P^L_{1,n}(z) & Q^L_{1,n}(z) \\ -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1} \tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(z) & -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1} Q^R_{2,n-1}(z) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_N z^{-n} & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^n \end{pmatrix}, \qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\},$$

and

$$X_0(z) := \begin{pmatrix} I_N & Q^L_{1,0}(z) \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe that $X_0(z) = Y_0(z)$.

Proposition 16. *For each $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $X_n(z)$ is the unique matrix function such that*

(1) $X_n(z) \left(\begin{smallmatrix} I_N z^n & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-n} \end{smallmatrix} \right)$ *is analytic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{T}$.*

[5] Incidentally, we observe that in the weak RHP we only know that is analytic everywhere but for a Borel set $B \subset \mathbb{T}$ of zero Lebesgue measure, $m(B) = 0$, and we can not apply the Liouville theorem.

(2) *Satisfies the jump condition for* $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$

$$\big(X_n\big)_+(\zeta) = \big(X_n\big)_-(\zeta) \begin{pmatrix} I_N & w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^{-n} \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

(3) *Asymptotically behaves as* $X_n(z) = I_{2N} + O(z^{-1})$ *for* $|z| \to \infty$.

Proposition 17 (Series for X_n)**.** (1) *The following Laurent series*

$$X_n(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,n} & 0_N \\ -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1} z^{-n-1} & 0_N \end{pmatrix} z^{-n} + \cdots + \begin{pmatrix} P^L_{1,n,n-1} & 0_N \\ -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger & 0_N \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}$$
$$+ \begin{pmatrix} 0_N & \hat{P}^L_{1,n}(-n) \\ 0_N & -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^R_{2,n}(-n-1) \end{pmatrix} z^n + \begin{pmatrix} 0_N & \hat{P}^L_{1,n}(-n-1) \\ 0_N & -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^R_{2,n}(-n-2) \end{pmatrix} z^{n+1} + \cdots$$

converges in the annulus $\mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$.

(2) *The following Taylor series about infinity*

$$X_n(z) = I_{2N} + \begin{pmatrix} P^L_{1,n,n-1} & -\hat{P}^L_{1,n}(1) \\ -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger & \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^R_{2,n-1}(2) \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \cdots$$
$$+ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,n} & -\hat{P}^L_{1,n}(n) \\ -\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1} & \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^R_{2,n-1}(n+1) \end{pmatrix} z^{-n} + \begin{pmatrix} 0_N & -\hat{P}^L_{1,n}(n+1) \\ 0_N & \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^R_{2,n-1}(n+2) \end{pmatrix} z^{-n-1} + \cdots$$

converges at $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$.

We see that the Laurent expansion at the origin is rather peculiar in its block structure.

(1) The matrix $\big[X_n(z)\big]_{\text{principal}} = (X_n(z) - I_{2N})\left(\begin{smallmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ is the principal part of the Laurent series of X_N at $z = 0$. Thus, in the principal part the second block column cancels:

$$\big[X_n(z)\big]_{\text{principal}} = \begin{pmatrix} z^{-n}P^L_{1,n} - I_N & 0_N \\ -z^{-n}\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1} & 0_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

(2) The regular part of the Laurent series is $\big[X_n(z)\big]_{\text{regular}} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{smallmatrix}\right) + X_n(z)\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 0_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N \end{smallmatrix}\right)$. Hence, the regular part $\big[X_n(z)\big]_{\text{regular}} - \left(\begin{smallmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ has a zero first block column

$$\big[X_n(z)\big]_{\text{regular}} = \begin{pmatrix} I_N & z^n Q^L_{1,n}(z) \\ 0_N & -z^n\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}Q^R_{n-1}(z) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Definition 14. *We write the Taylor series of* $X_n(z)$ *about infinity, which converges for* $z \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$*, as follows*

$$X_n(z) = I_{2N} + X^{(1)}_n z^{-1} + X^{(2)}_n z^{-2} + \cdots \tag{19}$$

where

$$X^{(i)}_n := \begin{pmatrix} a^{(i)}_n & b^{(i)}_n \\ c^{(i)}_n & d^{(i)}_n \end{pmatrix} \qquad i \geqslant 0, \qquad a^{(i)}_n, b^{(i)}_n, , c^{(i)}_n, d^{(i)}_n \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}.$$

For $n = 1$ *we use the simplified notation* $X^{(1)}_n = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_n & b_n \\ c_n & d_n \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

Then, the matrix function $Y_n(Z)$ for $z \in \bar{\mathbb{D}}$ can be expressed as

$$Y_n(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z^n I_N + a_n z^{n-1} + O(z^{n-2}) & b_n z^{-n-1} + b^{(2)}_n z^{-n-2} + O(z^{-n-3}) \\ c_n z^{n-1} + c^{(2)}_n z^{n-2} + O(z^{n-3}) & z^{-n} I_N + d_n z^{-n-1} + O(z^{-n-2}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{20}$$

Where —recall (17), (18) and (20)— we have

$$a^{(i)}_n = c^{(i)}_n = 0_N, \qquad i > n, \tag{21}$$

$$d^{(i)}_0 = 0_N, \qquad i \geqslant 1. \tag{22}$$

Then, Proposition 17 implies

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= P^{L}_{1,n,n-1}, & b_n &= -\hat{P}^{L}_{1,n}(1),\\ c_n &= -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}, & d_n &= \big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^{R}_{2,n-1}(2),\\ a^{(2)}_n &= P^{L}_{1,n,n-2}, & b^{(2)}_n &= -\hat{P}^{L}_{1,n-1}(2),\\ c^{(2)}_n &= -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(P^{R}_{2,n-1,1}\big)^{\dagger}, & d^{(2)}_n &= \big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\hat{P}^{R}_{2,n-1}(3). \end{aligned}$$

4. Recursion relations and systems of matrix linear ordinary differential equations

From hereon we will assume that the matrix of weights $w : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ has an analytic extension to the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ with an analytic inverse on this annulus.[6] This is, indeed, a strong assumption but one can imagine many examples fitting in this family, for example weights of Freud type of the form $w(\zeta) = \prod_{i=1}^{M} \exp(V_i(\zeta))$. where $V_i(\zeta)$, $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$, are matrix Laurent polynomials in $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$. For example $w(\zeta) = \exp(V\zeta)\exp(V^{\dagger}\bar{\zeta})$ will be of this type and moreover Hermitian. This example, in the scalar case $N = 1$, is called in [77] modified Bessel, as its moment are connected with the modified Bessel functions. Another scenario is to have

$$w(z) = z^{-m}v(z)$$

$m \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$, where $v(z)$ is analytic in $\mathbb{C}$ with Taylor series $v(z) = v_0 + v_1 z + \cdots$, where v_0 is non singular.

Definition 15. *We consider*

$$Z_n(z) := \begin{pmatrix} P^{L}_{1,n}(z) & Q^{L}_{1,n}(z)\\ -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\tilde{P}^{R}_{2,n-1}(z) & -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}Q^{R}_{2,n-1}(z)\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} w(z)z^{-n} & 0_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}, \qquad n \in \{1,2,\dots\} \tag{23}$$

and

$$Z_0(z) := \begin{pmatrix} w(z) & Q^{L}_{1,0}(z)\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}.$$

Proposition 18. *For $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ and for each $n \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$ the block matrix function $Z_n(z)$ satisfies the following jump condition f*

$$\big(Z_n\big)_+(\zeta) = \big(Z_n\big)_-(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & I_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}. \tag{24}$$

Proof. For $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (Z_n)_+(\zeta) &= (Y_n)_+(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n & 0_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}\\ &= (Y_n)_-(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n & 0_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}\\ &= (Y_n)_-(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n & w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}\\ &= (Y_n)_-(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} w(\zeta)\bar{\zeta}^n & 0_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} I_N & I_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}\\ &= (Z_n)_-(\zeta)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & I_N\\ 0_N & I_N\end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

It is remarkable that the jump condition is now is expressed in terms of a constant matrix. The block matrix $Z_n(z)$ can also be regarded as the solution of a Riemann–Hilbert problem. Precisely, the following simple result holds.

[6] Consequently, the right logarithmic derivative $\frac{d\,w(z)}{d\,z}\big(w(z)\big)^{-1}$ is also analytic in the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$.

Proposition 19. *The block matrix function $Z_n(z)$ is the unique matrix such that*

(1) $Z_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} (w(z))^{-1}z^n & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix}$ *is analytic at* $\mathbb{C}\setminus\mathbb{T}$.
(2) *Satisfies the jump condition* (24) $\forall \zeta \in \mathbb{T}$.
(3) *About infinity has the following asymptotic:* $Z_n(z) = (I_{2N} + O(z^{-1}))\begin{pmatrix} w(z) & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-n} \end{pmatrix}$ *for* $z \to \infty$.

4.1. **Recursion relations.**

Definition 16 (Szegő matrix)**.** *For each* $n \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$ *we introduce the Szegő matrices*

$$R_n(z) := Z_{n+1}(z)\big(Z_n(z)\big)^{-1}.$$

Definition 17. *Given a Laurent series* $L(z) = \sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}} L_m z^m$ *the expression stands for the Laurent series gotten from* $L(z)$ *by disregarding the powers less than* j*, where* $j \in \mathbb{Z}$*, i.e.,* $[L(z)]_{\geqslant j} := \sum_{m\geqslant j} L_m z^m$.

Proposition 20. *The Szegő matrix* $R_n(z)$ *can be alternatively expressed as*

$$R_n(z) = Y_{n+1}(z)\begin{pmatrix} z^{-1}I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix}\big(Y_n(z)\big)^{-1} \tag{25}$$

$$= X_{n+1}(z)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & z^{-1}I_N \end{pmatrix}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1}. \tag{26}$$

Lemma 1. *The matrix* R_n *is analytic at* $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$.

Proof. The matrices $Z_{n+1}(z)$ and $(Z_n(z))^{-1}$ are analytic at $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\mathbb{T}\cup\{0\})$ while the $Z_n(z)$'s jump at $\mathbb{T}$ is a constant matrix which does not depend on n, i.e., R_n is continuous on the unit circle and, consequently, analytic in the complex plane but for the origin. □

Proposition 21. *The Szegő matrix has the form*

$$R_n(z) = R_{n,0} + R_{n,-1}z^{-1}, \tag{27}$$

with

$$R_{n,0} := \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}, \qquad R_{n,-1} := \begin{pmatrix} a_{n+1}-a_n & -b_n \\ c_{n+1} & I_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Considering that $R_n(z)$ is analytic on the complex plane but for a possible singularity at $z=0$ and (25), we deduce that $R_n(z)$ has a simple pole at the origin. To explicitly compute $R_n(z)$ we use (26) at $z=\infty$ and, as there is no jump at the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$, analytically extend the result to the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, which can be easily achieved if we truncate the Taylor series about infinity and keep only those terms involving z^j with $j \geqslant -1$

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(z) &= \Big[(I_{2N} + X^{(1)}_{n+1}z^{-1} + \cdots)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}(I_{2N} - X^{(1)}_n z^{-1} + \cdots)\Big]_{\geqslant -1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix} X^{(1)}_n z^{-1} + X^{(1)}_{n+1}\begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} I_N + (a_{n+1}-a_n)z^{-1} & -b_n z^{-1} \\ c_{n+1}z^{-1} & z^{-1}I_N \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 1. *The recursion equations*

$$Y_{n+1}(z) = R_n(z)Y_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} I_N z & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix}, \tag{28}$$

$$X_{n+1}(z) = R_n(z)X_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z \end{pmatrix}, \tag{29}$$

hold true. We also have

$$Y_n(z) = R_{n-1}(z)\cdots R_0(z)\begin{pmatrix} I_N z^n & \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{w(\zeta)\,dm(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z}, \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix} \tag{30}$$

$$X_n(z) = R_{n-1}(z)\cdots R_0(z)\begin{pmatrix} I_N & z^n\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \frac{w(\zeta)\,dm(\zeta)}{1-\bar{\zeta}z} \\ 0_N & I_N z^n \end{pmatrix}. \tag{31}$$

Proof. Equations (28) and (29) are a direct consequence of Proposition 20, and form them we derive (30) and (31). □

Notice that $R_{n-1}(z)\cdots R_0(z)$ is usually called as transfer matrix, see [72]. The following recursion relations have been proved by algebraic means in [28] and [18] for the Szegő matrix polynomials. Here we give a more analytical proof based in the Riemann–Hilbert problem and add two analogous recursion relations for the Cauchy transforms, which are not an immediate consequence of the previous recursions

Theorem 2 (Recursion relations)**.** *The following equations*

$$\begin{aligned} P^L_{1,n+1}(z) &= zP^L_{1,n}(z) + \alpha^L_{1,n+1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z), \\ \tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z) &= \left(\alpha^R_{2,n}\right)^\dagger P^L_{1,n}(z) + \left(I_N - \left(\alpha^R_{2,n}\right)^\dagger \alpha^L_{1,n}\right)\tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(z), \\ Q^L_{1,n+1}(z) &= Q^L_{1,n}(z) + \alpha^L_{1,n+1}Q^R_{2,n}(z), \\ zQ^R_{2,n}(z) &= \left(\alpha^R_{2,n}\right)^\dagger Q^L_{1,n}(z) + \left(I_N - \left(\alpha^R_{2,n}\right)^\dagger \alpha^L_{1,n}\right)Q^R_{2,n-1}(z), \end{aligned}$$

are satisfied.

Proof. The first step is to write

$$\begin{pmatrix} P^L_{1,n+1}(z) & Q^L_{1,n+1}(z) \\ -\left(H^R_n\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z) & -\left(H^R_n\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n}(z) \end{pmatrix} \\ = \begin{pmatrix} I_N + (a_{n+1}-a_n)z^{-1} & -b_n z^{-1} \\ c_{n+1}z^{-1} & I_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} P^L_{1,n}(z)z & Q^L_{1,n}(z) \\ -\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(z)z & -\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n-1}(z) \end{pmatrix},$$

from where we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} P^L_{1,n+1}(z) &= \left(I_N z + (a_{n+1}-a_n)\right)P^L_n(z) + b_n\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(z), \\ -\left(H^R_n\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z) &= c_{n+1}P^L_{1,n}(z) - \left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(z), \\ Q^L_{1,n+1}(z) &= \left(I_N + (a_{n+1}-a_n)z^{-1}\right)Q^L_{1,n}(z) + b_n\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n-1}(z)z^{-1}, \\ -\left(H^R_n\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n}(z) &= c_{n+1}z^{-1}Q^L_{1,n}(z) - z^{-1}\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n-1}(z), \end{aligned}$$

and, consequently, obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P^L_{1,n+1}(z) &= \left(I_N z + a_{n+1} - a_n + b_n c_{n+1}\right)P^L_{1,n}(z) + b_n\left(H^R_n\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z), \\ \tilde{P}^R_{2,n}(z) &= -H^R_n c_{n+1}P^L_{1,n}(z) + H^R_n\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}\tilde{P}^R_{2,n-1}(z), \\ Q^L_{1,n+1}(z) &= \left(I_N + (a_{n+1} - a_n + b_n c_{n+1}z^{-1}\right)Q^L_{1,n}(z) + b_n\left(H^R_n\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n}(z), \\ Q^R_{2,n}(z) &= -H^R_n c_{n+1}Q^L_{1,n}(z)z^{-1} + H^R_n\left(H^R_{n-1}\right)^{-1}Q^R_{2,n-1}(z)z^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (1) we conclude

$$\begin{aligned}
0_{\mathrm{N}} &= \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}(\zeta) w(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\, \mathrm{m}(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^{n-1} \\
&= \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \Big(\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} \zeta + a_{n+1} - a_n + b_n c_{n+1} \big) \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\zeta) + b_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n\big)^{-1} \tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(\zeta) \Big) w(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\, \mathrm{m}(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^{n-1} \\
&= \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\zeta) w(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\, \mathrm{m}(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^{n-1} \\
&\qquad + \big(a_{n+1} - a_n + b_n c_{n+1}\big) \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\zeta) w(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\, \mathrm{m}(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^{n-1} + b_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n\big)^{-1} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} \tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(\zeta) w(\zeta)\, \mathrm{d}\, \mathrm{m}(\zeta) \bar{\zeta}^{n-1} \\
&= \big(a_{n+1} - a_n + b_n c_{n+1}\big) \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}_n
\end{aligned}$$

and, therefore, we infer that

$$a_{n+1} - a_n + b_n c_{n+1} = 0_{\mathrm{N}}. \tag{32}$$

Then, the recursion relations simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}(z) &= \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) z + b_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n\big)^{-1} \tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z), \\
\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z) &= -\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n c_{n+1} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) + \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} \tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z), \\
\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}(z) &= \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) + b_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n\big)^{-1} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z), \\
\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z) &= -\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n c_{n+1} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) z^{-1} + \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z) z^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

A further simplification is obtained by evaluating the first recursion equation at $z = 0$, which gives

$$\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1} = b_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n\big)^{-1},$$

so that

$$b_n = \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n. \tag{33}$$

Moreover, from (20) and (17) we get

$$c_n = -(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1})^{-1} \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}, \tag{34}$$

which introduced in the second recursion equation gives

$$\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z) = \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) + \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} \tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z),$$

that evaluated at $z = 0$ implies

$$\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} = \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n} + \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1},$$

so that

$$\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} = \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} - \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}. \tag{35}$$

□

Proposition 22. *We have that the following relations*

$$\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} = \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} - \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}, \qquad \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}_n \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} = \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} - \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n} \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}$$

are satisfied and, consequently, the matrices

$$\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} - \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}, \qquad \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}} - \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1} \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger}$$

are not singular. At the origin we have

$$\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(0) = \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}_n, \qquad \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(0) = -\big(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}_n = -\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n \big(\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger},$$

while about infinity the behavior is

$$\lim_{z\to\infty} \big(z^{n+1} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z)\big) = -\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n = -\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{L}}_n, \alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{1,n+1} \qquad \lim_{z\to\infty} \big(z^{n+1} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}(z)\big) = \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n.$$

Proof. Part of these statements are just a recollection of some intermediate conclusions obtained in the discussion of the previous proof and also of Proposition 14. For the other we argue as follows. As the Cauchy transforms are analytic at the origin we can evaluate the third and fourth recursion relations at $z = 0$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} H^{L}_{n+1} &= H^{L}_{n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} Q^{R}_{2,n}(0), \\ 0_N &= \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger} H^{L}_{1,n} + \left(I_N - \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\right) Q^{R}_{2,n-1}(0). \end{aligned}$$

Now, from (35) we deduce that $I_N - \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n}$ is not a singular matrix, so that we can clean $Q^{R}_{2,n-1}(0)$ and write

$$Q^{R}_{2,n-1}(0) = -\left(I_N - \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\right)^{-1} \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger} H^{L}_{n}, \tag{36}$$

that introduced in the first equation gives

$$\left(I_N + \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\left(I_N - \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\right)^{-1} \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger}\right) H^{L}_{n+1} = H^{L}_{n}.$$

But, given two matrices A and B such that $I_N - BA$ is not a singular matrix, then the matrix $(I_N - AB)$ is neither singular, and $(I_N - AB)^{-1} = I_N + A(I_N - BA)^{-1}B$. Therefore, we get

$$H^{L}_{n+1}\left(H^{L}_{n}\right)^{-1} = I_N - \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger}.$$

Finally, we look at the behavior about infinity of third recursion relation to get

$$\lim_{z\to\infty}\left(z^{n+1} Q^{L}_{1,n+1}(z)\right) = \lim_{z\to\infty}\left(z^{n+1} Q^{L}_{1,n}(z)\right) + \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} \lim_{z\to\infty}\left(z^{n+1} Q^{R}_{2,n}(z)\right),$$

and Proposition 14 gives

$$0 = \lim_{z\to\infty}\left(z^{n+1} Q^{L}_{1,n}(z)\right) + \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} H^{R}_{n}.$$

Now we simplify (36), which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{R}_{2,n}(0) &= -H^{R}_{n}\left(H^{R}_{n+1}\right)^{-1}\left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger} H^{L}_{n+1} \\ &= -H^{R}_{n}\left(\alpha^{L}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger} \\ &= -\left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger} H^{L}_{n}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Proposition 17 of [18]. □

Corollary 2. *The Szegő matrix can be written as follows*

$$R_n(z) = \begin{pmatrix} I_N + \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}(\alpha^{R}_{2,n})^{\dagger} z^{-1} & -\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} H^{R}_{n} z^{-1} \\ -(H^{R}_{n})^{-1}\left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger} z^{-1} & I_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{37}$$

Proof. Just use (33), (34) and (32). □

Proposition 23 (Verblunsky parametrization of X_n)**.** *The coefficients $X^{(j)}_{n}$, for each $n \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ can be parametrized in terms of the Verblunsky matrices $\left\{\alpha^{L}_{1,m}, \left(\alpha^{R}_{2,m}\right)^{\dagger}\right\}_{m=1}^{n}$, the quasi-tau matrices $\left\{H^{R}_{m}\right\}_{m=0}^{n}$ and $X_{n=1}$. In particular,*

(1) *For $X^{(1)}_{n} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_n & b_n \\ c_n & d_n \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ we have the expressions*

$$\begin{aligned} a_n &= \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} \alpha^{L}_{1,m+1}(\alpha^{R}_{2,m})^{\dagger}, \qquad b_n = \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} H^{R}_{n}, \\ c_n &= -(H^{R}_{n-1})^{-1}\left(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}, \quad d_n = -\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} (H^{R}_{m})^{-1}\left(\alpha^{R}_{2,m}\right)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,m+1} H^{R}_{m}, \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

where we have introduced, for convenience, the notation $\alpha^{R}_{2,0} := I_N$.

(2) *For* $X_n^{(2)} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_n^{(2)} & b_n^{(2)} \\ c_n^{(2)} & d_n^{(2)} \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ *we have the expressions*

$$a_{n+1}^{(2)} = a_1^{(2)} + \sum_{m=1}^{n} A_m^{(2)},$$

$$b_n^{(2)} = \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} H_{n+1}^{R} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,n}^{L} H_n^{R} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} H_n^{R} \Big(\alpha_{1,1}^{R} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_{2,m}^{L})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,m+1}^{R} \Big),$$

$$c_{n+1}^{(2)} = -(H_n^{R})^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger} \Big(\alpha_{1,1}^{L} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{1,m+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,m}^{R})^{\dagger} \Big) - (H_{n-1}^{R})^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n-1}^{R})^{\dagger},$$

$$d_{n+1}^{(2)} = d_1^{(2)} + \sum_{m=0}^{n} D_m^{(2)},$$

where

$$A_n^{(2)} := \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger} \Big(\alpha_{1,1}^{L} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} \alpha_{1,m+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,m}^{R})^{\dagger} \Big) + \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} H_n^{R} (H_{n-1}^{R})^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n-1}^{R})^{\dagger},$$

$$D_n^{(2)} := -(H_n^{R})^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} H_{n+1}^{R} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,n}^{L} H_n^{R} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} H_n^{R} \Big(\alpha_{1,1}^{R} + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_{2,m}^{L})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,m+1}^{R} \Big).$$

Proof. The expressions for b_n and c_n were deduced before, see (33), (34) and (32) implies

$$a_{n+1} - a_n = \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger}.$$

Observe that we can use a telescoping sum to get

$$a_{n+1} - a_1 = \sum_{m=1}^{n} (a_{m+1} - a_m) = \sum_{m=1}^{n} \alpha_{1,m+1}^{L} (\alpha_{2,m}^{R})^{\dagger}$$

with $a_1 = P_{1,1,0}^{L} = \alpha_{1,1}^{L}$. Consequently, the expression for a_n follows.

Now we start we the essential part of the proof. We will make a substantial use of (29) in the form

$$X_{n+1}(z) \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = R_n(z) X_n(z), \tag{39}$$

which can be expanded, for $j \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, as follows

$$X_{n+1}^{(j+1)} \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix} + X_{n+1}^{(j)} \begin{pmatrix} 0_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & I_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_N & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix} X_n^{(j+1)} + \begin{pmatrix} a_{n+1} - a_n & -b_n \\ c_{n+1} & I_N \end{pmatrix} X_n^{(j)}.$$

In terms of the different blocks we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+1}^{(j+1)} - a_n^{(j+1)} &= (a_{n+1} - a_n) a_n^{(j)} - b_n c_n^{(j)}, & b_n^{(j+1)} &= b_{n+1}^{(j)} - (a_{n+1} - a_n) b_n^{(j)} + b_n d_n^{(j)}, \\ c_{n+1}^{(j+1)} &= c_{n+1} a_n^{(j)} + c_n^{(j)}, & d_{n+1}^{(j)} - d_n^{(j)} &= c_{n+1} b_n^{(j)}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

which for $j = 1$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+1}^{(2)} - a_n^{(2)} &= (a_{n+1} - a_n) a_n - b_n c_n, & b_n^{(2)} &= b_{n+1} - (a_{n+1} - a_n) b_n + b_n d_n, \\ c_{n+1}^{(2)} &= c_{n+1} a_n + c_n, & d_{n+1} - d_n &= c_{n+1} b_n. \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

In particular, for $j = 1$ the last equation is the following telescoping relation

$$d_{n+1} - d_n = -(H_n^{R})^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^{R})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} H_n^{R},$$

where we have used (33). Using the telescoping trick we obtain

$$d_{n+1} = d_1 - \sum_{m=1}^{n} (H_m^{R})^{-1} (\alpha_{2,m}^{R})^{\dagger} \alpha_{1,m+1}^{L} H_m^{R}.$$

Here, according to (20) we have $d_1 = -\Big(\oint_{\mathbb{T}} w(\zeta)\, d\, m(\zeta)\Big)^{-1} \oint_{\mathbb{T}} w(\zeta)\zeta\, d\, m(\zeta)$, and recalling (2) we see $d_1 = -\big(H_0^R\big)^{-1}\alpha_{1,1}^L H_0^R$.[7] In terms of Verblunsky coefficients (40) is

(42)
$$a_{n+1}^{(j+1)} - a_n^{(j+1)} = \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger a_n^{(j)} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R c_n^{(j)}, \qquad b_n^{(j+1)} = b_{n+1}^{(j)} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger b_n^{(j)} + \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R d_n^{(j)},$$
$$c_{n+1}^{(j+1)} = -(H_n^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger a_n^{(j)} + c_n^{(j)}, \qquad d_{n+1}^{(j)} - d_n^{(j)} = -(H_n^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger b_n^{(j)}$$

we conclude that whenever the coefficients $a_n^{(j)}, b_n^{(j)}, c_n^{(j)}$ are given for all $n \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$ we can determine $d_n^{(j)}$ and $a_n^{(j+1)}, b_n^{(j+1)}, c_n^{(j+1)}$ also for all $n \in \{0,1,2,\dots\}$. Which is the main statement of the Proposition. For example, let us put again $j = 1$ in (42) for the first three equations and $j = 2$ for the last equation to get

$$a_{n+1}^{(2)} - a_n^{(2)} = \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger a_n - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R c_n, \qquad b_n^{(2)} = b_{n+1} - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger b_n + \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R d_n,$$
$$c_{n+1}^{(2)} = -(H_n^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger a_n + c_n, \qquad d_{n+1}^{(2)} - d_n^{(2)} = -(H_n^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger b_n^{(2)},$$

so that using (38) we deduce

$$a_{n+1}^{(2)} - a_n^{(2)} = \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger\Big(\alpha_{1,1}^L + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha_{1,m+1}^L(\alpha_{2,m}^R)^\dagger\Big) + \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R(H_{n-1}^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}^R\big)^\dagger,$$

$$b_n^{(2)} = \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_{n+1}^R - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n}^L H_n^R - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R\Big(\alpha_{1,1}^R + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\big(\alpha_{2,m}^L\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,m+1}^R\Big),$$

$$c_{n+1}^{(2)} = -(H_n^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger\Big(\alpha_{1,1}^L + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha_{1,m+1}^L(\alpha_{2,m}^R)^\dagger\Big) - (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}^R\big)^\dagger,$$

$$d_{n+1}^{(2)} - d_n^{(2)} = -(H_n^R)^{-1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_{n+1}^R - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n}^L H_n^R - \alpha_{1,n+1}^L H_n^R\Big(\alpha_{1,1}^R + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\big(\alpha_{2,m}^L\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,m+1}^R\Big).$$

□

4.2. **Pearson equations for the matrix of weights and some of its consequences.** In this subsection we analyze an important matrix $M_n(z)$ binded to the Riemann–Hilbert problem —as well as to to the right logarithmic derivative of the matrix of measures—, which is analytic in the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and provides a linear system of ordinary differential equations for the matrix Szegő polynomials and its Cauchy transforms. Moreover, it satisfies a compatibility condition with the Szegő matrix $R_n(z)$. One of its major virtues, that we will discuss in the next section, is that it leads to non linear difference equations of Painlevé type for the Verblunsky coefficients.

Definition 18. *We introduce the right logarithmic derivatives of the analytic extension to the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ of matrix of measures $w(z)$ and of $Z_n(z)$ and*

$$W(z) := \frac{d\, w(z)}{d\, z}\big(w(z)\big)^{-1}, \tag{43}$$

$$M_n(z) := \frac{d\, Z_n(z)}{d\, z}\big(Z_n(z)\big)^{-1}. \tag{44}$$

Observe that for $n = 0$ we have

$$M_0(z) = \begin{pmatrix} W(z) & \dfrac{d\, Q_{1,0}^L(z)}{d\, z} - W(z)Q_{1,0}^L(z) \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}. \tag{45}$$

Equation (43) can be understood as a Pearson equation for the matrix of weights:

$$\frac{d\, w(z)}{d\, z} = W(z)w(z). \tag{46}$$

[7] We have $\mu(\mathbb{T}) = H_0^R = H_0^L$ and $\oint_{\mathbb{T}} w(\zeta)\zeta\, d\, m(\zeta) = -\alpha_{1,1}^L\mu(\mathbb{T}) = -\mu(\mathbb{T})\alpha_{1,1}^R$.

This is a linear first order differential system whose properties are determined by $W(z)$. These systems constitute a very deep and profound branch in Mathematics, with pioneering work by George Birkhoff [25], for different treatments of the subject we refer the reader to [57, 74, 116, 34, 107, 95, 15, 76]. Is relevant to remark the change of the point of view. For scalar systems with $N = 1$ we normally take the weight as an explicit Freud type weight. However, for the general matrix scenario we have avoided this approach and preferred to give $W(z)$, and consider the extension of the matrix of weights $w(z)$ as a fundamental solution of (46). The Freud approach will not lead, in a general scenario, to the matrix discrete Painlevé II systems derived later in §5.

Proposition 24 (Differential systems)**.** *Equation* (44) *can be understood as a system of differential equations and can be written in the following two alternative forms*

$$\mathrm{M}_n(z) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Y}_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(\mathrm{Y}_n(z)\big)^{-1} + \mathrm{Y}_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} W(z) - n\mathrm{I}_N z^{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}\big(\mathrm{Y}_n(z)\big)^{-1}, \tag{47}$$

$$= \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{X}_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(\mathrm{X}_n(z)\big)^{-1} + \mathrm{X}_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} W(z) & 0_N \\ 0_N & -n\mathrm{I}_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}\big(\mathrm{X}_n(z)\big)^{-1}. \tag{48}$$

Proposition 25 (Analytic properties of M_n)**.** *The matrix $\mathrm{M}_n(z)$ is analytic at the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$.*

Proof. It follows from (47) that $\mathrm{M}_n(z)$ is analytic at $\mathbb{C}\setminus(\{0\}\cup\mathbb{T})$. From (23) we infer that there is no jump at $\mathbb{T}$ and, consequently, $\mathrm{M}_n(z)$ is analytic at $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$. □

Proposition 26. *The following differential equations are satisfied*

$$\mathrm{M}_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) \\ -\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z)\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z} - nz^{-1}\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) + \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z)W(z) \\ -\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\Big(\dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z} - nz^{-1}\tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z) + \tilde{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z)W(z)\Big)\end{pmatrix}, \tag{49}$$

$$\mathrm{M}_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z) \\ -\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z)\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z} \\ -\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\end{pmatrix}, \tag{50}$$

for $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. For $n = 0$ we have

$$\mathrm{M}_0(z)\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{I}_N \\ 0_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} W(z) \\ 0_N \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathrm{M}_0(z)\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,0}(z) \\ \mathrm{I}_N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,0}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z} \\ 0_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows directly from (44) and (23). □

Observe that (49) can be written

$$\mathrm{M}_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}z^{-n} + \cdots + \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{n,1,n-1}z^{-1} + \mathrm{I}_N \\ -\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}z^{-n} - \cdots - \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}z^{-1}\end{pmatrix} \tag{51}$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} -n\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}z^{-n-1} - \cdots - \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{n,1,n-1}z^{-2} + (\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}z^{-n} + \cdots + \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{L}}_{n,1,n-1}z^{-1} + \mathrm{I}_N)W(z) \\ n\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}z^{-n-1} + \cdots + \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}z^{-2} - \big(\big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}z^{-n} + \cdots + \big(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}z^{-1}\big)W(z)\end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe that Pearson equation (46) is a first order system of ODE for the matrix of weights $w(z)$.

Definition 19. *In terms of the local behavior at $z = 0$ we distinguish three cases for the matrix of weights, two singular cases and a regular case, depending on the form of the principal part of the Laurent series of the logarithmic derivative $W(z)$ of the matrix of weights $w(z)$ in the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$:*

(1) ***Ordinary case**. The right logarithmic derivative* (43) *of the matrix of weights is regular at the origin*

$$W = W_0 + W_1 z + \cdots. \tag{52}$$

(2) ***Fuchsian case***. *Now, the right logarithmic derivative* (43) *of the matrix of weights has a simple pole at the origin*

$$W = W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + \cdots, \tag{53}$$

with $W_{-1} \neq 0_N$.

(3) ***Non-Fuchsian case***. *The right logarithmic derivative* (43) *of the matrix of weights is the following Laurent polynomial*

$$W = W_{-r}z^{-r} + W_{-r+1}z^{-r+1} + \cdots, \tag{54}$$

with $r > 1$ *and* $W_{-r} \neq 0_N$.

We introduce the notation

$$W_n^{[0]} := \begin{cases} -nI_N, & \textit{ordinary case,} \\ W_{-1} - nI_N, & \textit{Fuchsian case,} \\ W_{-r}, & \textit{non-Fuchsian case, } r > 1. \end{cases}$$

The equation (54) tell us that at $z = 0$ we have an regular point, or a Fuchsian singularity or a non-Fuchsian singularity of rank $r > 1$.

Following [15] we say that the point $z = 0$ is is a regular singular point for (46) if there exists a constant k such that all its solutions in every sector in the complex plane with $z = 0$ as a vertex, grow no faster than $|z|^k$ as $z \to 0$ within the sector. Fuchsian singularities are regular singularities but the converse is not always true.

Proposition 27. *In order to have a Hölder matrix of weights* $w(\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, *the matrix* $W(z)$ *must be such that the Pearson system* (46) *has trivial monodromy.*

Proof. Given the the monodromy matrix $M = \exp(2\pi i R)$, $R \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$, of the system (46) a fundamental solution is of the form $S(z) = P(z)z^R$ where $P : \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \to GL(N, \mathbb{C})$ is analytic; i.e., the solutions of (46) are multivalued of the form $z^\alpha F(z)$, where $\exp(2\pi i\,\alpha)$ is an eigenvalue of the monodromy matrix and $F(z)$ is analytic at the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$. Thus, if we want a Hölder restriction on $\mathbb{T}$ —and, consequently, single valued functions— the only possible matrices R are those with integer eigenvalues, and therefore the monodromy matrix must be the identity. Hence the Pearson system (46) has trivial monodromy. □

Let us notice that any equivalent system, and, therefore with the same trivial monodromy has a corresponding matrix of the form

$$\tilde{W}(z) = \frac{d\,\Phi(z)}{d\,z}\big(\Phi(z)\big)^{-1} + \Phi(z)W(z)\big(\Phi(z)\big)^{-1}$$

where $\Phi : \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \to GL(N, \mathbb{C})$ is analytic in the annulus with at most a pole at $z = 0$.

This triviality of the monodromy could be avoided if we relax the Hölder conditions on the weight, and just request piecewise Hölder weights on $\mathbb{T}$, allowing at the discontinuities space for the branches of multivalued functions that non–trivial monodromy implies. Then, we still have a RH problem but in the weak sense and uniqueness is not ensure, and the jump on $\mathbb{T}$ is only ensured almost everywhere. A much more detailed analysis will be need for the analytic properties of the $R_n(z)$ and $M_n(z)$. This could be connected with non trivial monodromy problems as there only piecewise Hölderity is required, see [57]. For piecewise continuous jump functions see [34, 96]. Moreover, in Lemma 7.12 in [43] we read that as long $f \in H^1(\mathbb{T})$, i.e. $\oint_{\mathbb{T}} \big(|f(\zeta)|^2 + |f'(\zeta)|^2\big)|\,d\,\zeta| < \infty$, where f' denotes a weak derivative, the jump of its Cauchy transform satisfies $f(\zeta) = (Cf)_+(\zeta) - (Cf)_-(\zeta)$ pointwise in the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$, and not only almost everywhere. This, together with the proof of Theorem 7.18 in [43], could indicate that the RH could be generalize to more general $H^1(\mathbb{T})$-matrix of weights, and that instead of analytic extensions to the annulus $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ we could deal with analytic functions on the universal cover of the annulus; i.e., with multivalued functions.

Theorem 3. *Let us assume* W *as prescribed in in Definition 19. Then, the Laurent series of* $M_n(z)$ *is*

$$M_n(z) = \begin{cases} M_n^{[0]}z^{-1} + M_{n,0} + M_{n,1}z + \cdots, & \textit{ordinary and Fuchsian cases,} \\ M_n^{[0]}z^{-r} + M_{n,-r+1}z^{-r+1} + M_{n,-r+2}z^{-r+2} + \cdots, & \textit{non-Fuchsian cases,} \end{cases} \tag{55}$$

where the leading coefficient is

$$M_n^{[0]} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,n}^L W_n^{[0]} (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger & -\alpha_{1,n}^L W_n^{[0]} H_n^R \\ -(H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} W_n^{[0]} (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger & (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} W_n^{[0]} H_n^R \end{pmatrix}, \tag{56}$$

for $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$ *and for* $n = 0$ *we have in both singular cases (regular and irregular)*

$$M_n^{[0]} = \begin{pmatrix} W_0^{[0]} & -W_0^{[0]} H_0^R \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}. \tag{57}$$

Proof. To prove (56) we introduce (54) into (51) and (50) and then look at the leading part to obtain

$$M_n^{[0]} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,n}^L \\ -(H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{1,n}^L W_n^{[0]} \\ -(H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} W_n^{[0]} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{58}$$

$$M_n^{[0]} \begin{pmatrix} Q_{1,n}^L(0) \\ -(H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} Q_{2,n-1}^R(0) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_N \\ 0_N \end{pmatrix}. \tag{59}$$

With the notation

$$M_n^{[0]} = \begin{pmatrix} A_n & B_n \\ C_n & D_n \end{pmatrix},$$

$A_n, B_n, C_n, D_n \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$, a component-wise form of the system of matrix equations (58) and (59) is

$$\begin{aligned} A_n \alpha_{1,n}^L - B_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} &= \alpha_{1,n} W_n^{[0]}, \\ A_n H_n^L + B_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L &= 0_N, \\ C_n \alpha_{1,n}^L - D_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} &= -(H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} W_n^{[0]}, \\ C_n H_n^L + D_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L &= 0_N. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that, see Proposition 22,

$$Q_{1,n}^L(0) = H_n^L, \qquad Q_{2,n-1}^R(0) = -(\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L.$$

Consequently, cleaning A and C in the second equations in each of the two systems we get

$$A_n = -B_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L (H_n^L)^{-1}, \qquad C_n = -D_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L (H_n^L)^{-1}, \tag{60}$$

that we insert in the first equation of each system to get

$$\begin{aligned} B_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} \Big(I_N + (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L (H_n^L)^{-1} \alpha_{1,n}^L \Big) &= -\alpha_{1,n} W_n^{[0]}, \\ D_n (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} \Big(I_N + (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L (H_n^L)^{-1} \alpha_{1,n}^L \Big) &= (H_{n-1}^R)^{-1} W_n^{[0]}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us notice that, see Proposition 22,

$$H_n^L (H_{n-1}^L)^{-1} = I_N - \alpha_{1,n}^L (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger,$$

that implies

$$H_{n-1}^L (H_n^L)^{-1} = (I_N - \alpha_{1,n}^L (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger)^{-1}. \tag{61}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} I_N + (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger H_{n-1}^L (H_n^L)^{-1} \alpha_{1,n}^L &= I_N + (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger (I_N - \alpha_{1,n}^L (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger)^{-1} \alpha_{1,n}^L \\ &= (I_N - (\alpha_{2,n}^R)^\dagger \alpha_{1,n}^L)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the following fact: given any two matrices $R, S \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ with $I_N - RS$ not singular, then

$$I_N + S(I - RS)^{-1} R = (I_N - SR)^{-1}.$$

We clean B and D in the first step and, using (60) and (61), also A and C. The final result is

$$\begin{aligned}
A_n &= \alpha^{L}_{1,n} W^{[0]}_n \Big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big(I_N - \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big)^{-1},\\
B_n &= -\alpha^{L}_{1,n} W^{[0]}_n \big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big)H^{R}_{n-1},\\
C_n &= -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} W^{[0]}_n \Big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big(I_N - \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big)^{-1},\\
D_n &= \big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} W^{[0]}_n \big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big)H^{R}_{n-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

which taking into account that for pair of matrices $R, S \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ with $\det(I_N - SR) \neq 0$ we have $(I_N - RS)R(I_N - SR)^{-1} = R$ and that $\big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big)H^{R}_{n-1} = H^{R}_{n}$ gives the desired result. Finally, let us notice that (57) follows at once from (45). □

Proposition 28. *The compatibility equation*

$$\frac{d\,R_n(z)}{d\,z} = M_{n+1}(z)R_n(z) - R_n(z)M_n(z) \tag{62}$$

is fulfill.

Proof. From $Z_{n+1} = R_n Z_n$ we have

$$\frac{d\,R_n(z)}{d\,z}Z_n(z) + R_n(z)\frac{d\,Z_n(z)}{d\,z} = \frac{d\,Z_{n+1}(z)}{d\,z} \tag{63}$$

so that

$$\frac{d\,R_n(z)}{d\,z} + R_n\frac{d\,Z_n(z)}{d\,z}\big(Z_n(z)\big)^{-1} = \frac{d\,Z_{n+1}(z)}{d\,z}\big(Z_{n+1}(z)\big)^{-1}Z_{n+1}(z)\big(Z_n(z)\big)^{-1}$$

and the result follows. □

Proposition 29. *The following conditions are satisfied by the leading coefficients of the Szegő matrix* $R_n(z)$ *and the matrix* $M_n(z)$

$$M^{[0]}_{n+1}R_{n,-1} - R_{n,-1}M^{[0]}_n = \begin{cases} -R_{n,-1}, & \textit{ordinary and Fuchsian cases},\\ 0_{2N}, & \textit{non Fuchsian cases}. \end{cases} \tag{64}$$

Proof. We insert in (63) the Laurent series (37) of $R_n(z)$ and the Laurent series (55) of $M_n(z)$ and compute the leading coefficient in z^{-r-1}. □

Lemma 2. *The dyadic or tensor type representations*

$$R_{n,-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} \\ -\big(H^{R}_{n}\big)^{-1}\end{pmatrix}\Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}, -H^{R}_{n}\Big), \qquad M^{[0]}_n = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{L}_{1,n} \\ -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\end{pmatrix} W^{[0]}_n\Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}, -H^{R}_{n}\Big)$$

hold.

Proposition 30. *Compatibility conditions* (64) *are identically satisfied upon* (37) *and* (56).

Proof. We first observe that

$$\Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}, -H^{R}_{n}\Big)\begin{pmatrix} \alpha^{L}_{1,n} \\ -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\end{pmatrix} = \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + H^{R}_{n}\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} = I_N.$$

Then, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
M^{[0]}_{n+1}R_{n,-1} - R_{n,-1}M^{[0]}_n =& \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n+1} \\ -(H^R_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} W^{[0]}_{n+1}\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n+1})^\dagger, -H^R_{n+1}\Big) \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n+1} \\ -(H^R_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger, -H^R_n\Big) \\
&- \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n+1} \\ -(H^R_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger, -H^R_n\Big) \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n} \\ -(H^R_{n-1})^{-1} \end{pmatrix} W^{[0]}_n\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger, -H^R_n\Big) \\
=& \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n+1} \\ -(H^R_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} W^{[0]}_{n+1}\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger, -H^R_n\Big) - \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n+1} \\ -(H^R_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} W^{[0]}_n\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger, -H^R_n\Big) \\
=& \begin{pmatrix} \alpha^L_{1,n+1} \\ -(H^R_n)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} (W^{[0]}_{n+1} - W^{[0]}_n)\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger, -H^R_n\Big) \\
=& \begin{cases} -R_{n,-1}, & \text{ordinary and Fuchsian cases,} \\ 0_{2N}, & \text{non-Fuchsian cases,} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that

$$W^{[0]}_{n+1} - W^{[0]}_n = \begin{cases} -I_N, & \text{ordinary and regular singular cases,} \\ 0_N, & \text{non-Fuchsian cases.} \end{cases}$$

□

We now consider the behavior about infinity and assume a descending Laurent series for the right logarithmic derivative

Definition 20. *Let us assume that*

$$W(z) = W_s z^s + W_{s-1} z^{s-1} + \cdots,$$

where W_s is a non zero matrix and with the Laurent series converging in the annulus $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Then, we distinguish three cases when $s \leqslant -2$, $s = -1$ and $s \geqslant 0$ and introduce the corresponding matrices

$$W^{[\infty]}_n := \begin{cases} -nI_N, & \textit{case with } s < -1, \\ W_{-1} - nI_N, & \textit{case with } s = -1, \\ W_s, & \textit{case with s>-1.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 31. *Assuming that the right logarithmic derivative of the matrix of weights is as in Definition 20 we have a corresponding Laurent series*

$$M_n(z) = \begin{cases} M^{[\infty]}_n z^{-1} + M_{-2,n} z^{-2} + \cdots, & \textit{cases with } s \leqslant -1, \\ M^{[\infty]}_n z^s + M_{s-1,n} z^{s-1} + \cdots, & \textit{cases with } s \geqslant 0, \end{cases}$$

where

$$M^{[\infty]}_n := \begin{pmatrix} W^{[\infty]}_n & 0_n \\ 0_N & 0_N \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. It follows from (47) and the analicity of $Y_n(z)$ about infinity and its behavior normalized by the identity there, $Y_n(z) = I_{2N} + O(z^{-1})$, when $z \to \infty$. □

5. The matrix discrete Painlevé II system

In this section we apply the Riemann–Hilbert problem and the properties of matrix $M_n(z)$ to derive matrix nonlinear difference systems of equations satisfied by the Verblunsky coefficients.

From (48) and the form of $W(z)$ prescribed in Definition 19 we get

$$M_n(z) = \frac{dX_n(z)}{dz}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1} + X_n(z) \begin{pmatrix} W_{-r}z^{-r} + W_{-r+1}z^{-r+1} + \cdots + W_s z^s & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N z^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1}. \tag{65}$$

Recall that we have the Taylor series about infinity (19) and

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\,X_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z} = -X_n^{(1)}z^{-2} - 2X_n^{(2)}z^{-3} + \cdots, \qquad \big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1} = I_{2N} - X_n^{(1)}z^{-1} - \Big(X_n^{(2)} - \big(X_n^{(1)}\big)^2\Big)z^{-2} + \cdots$$

which converges on the exterior of the unit circle $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$. Consequently, in the annulus $\bar{\mathbb{D}}$, we can write

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\,X_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1} = -X_n^{(1)}z^{-2} - \big(2X_n^{(2)} - \big(X_n^{(1)}\big)^2\big)z^{-3} + \cdots.$$

Therefore, in the non-Fuchsian case to compute the coefficient $M_n^{[r]}$ of $M_n(z)$ we will require of the concourse of the matrices $\{X_n^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{s+r}$. In this case the contribution of the derivative term $\dfrac{\mathrm{d}\,X_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1}$ involves the coefficients $\{X_n^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{r-1}$. For the ordinary and Fuchsian case, the derivative term do not contribute at all, and we only need the concourse of $\{X_n^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{s+1}$. As we have seen in Proposition 23 all the coefficients can be parametrized in terms of the Verblunsky matrices $\big\{\alpha_{1,m}^L, \big(\alpha_{2,m}^R\big)^\dagger\big\}$, the quasi-tau matrices $\big\{H_m^R\big\}$ and the initial condition $X_{m=1}(z)$. The idea is to compare this expression, obtained about infinity, with the result obtained in Theorem 3 and, given that $M_n(z)$ is analytic in the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, equate both results. As a consequence, we will have a set of four, in general nonlinear, discrete matrix equations for $\big\{\alpha_{1,m}^L, \big(\alpha_{2,m}^R\big)^\dagger\big\}_{m=0}^n$ and $\big\{H_m^R\big\}_{m=0}^n$.

Notice that the term $-nI_N z^{-1}$ appearing in (65) will always contribute non trivially to the leading term computed about infinity with, for example and among many others, terms of the form

$$\Big[X_n^{(r-1)}, \begin{pmatrix} W_{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N \end{pmatrix}\Big], \quad \frac{1}{2}\Big[X_n^{(1)}, \Big[X_n^{(r-2)}, \begin{pmatrix} W_{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N \end{pmatrix}\Big]\Big], \quad \frac{1}{2}\Big[X_n^{(r-2)}, \Big[X_n^{(1)}, \begin{pmatrix} W_{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N \end{pmatrix}\Big]\Big], \quad \cdots$$

even when W_{-1} does cancel. Thus, the most simple situation with nonlinear contributions (cubic) of the Verblunsky matrices, appears when $W(z)$ has only three consecutive powers in z with z^{-1} among them. Namely, we are dealing with one of the following three cases

$$W(z) = W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + W_1 z, \tag{66}$$

$$W(z) = W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0, \tag{67}$$

$$W(z) = W_{-3}z^{-3} + W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1}, \tag{68}$$

While in the first case (66) we deal with a Fuchsian singularity at $z = 0$ in the two remaining cases (67) and (68) we have non-Fuchsian singularities. As we will see (66) and (67) lead to interesting matrix extensions of a discrete Painlevé II system for the Verblunsky coefficients of Szegő biorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle. Despite these nonlinear equations do have non local terms, they cancel when the corresponding leading terms about infinity of $W(z)$ are proportional to the identity matrix. For the third case (68), we have found that even in the scalar situation, $N = 1$, there are non local terms. But not only, apart from the Verblunsky matrices $\big\{\big(\alpha_{2,m}^R\big)^\dagger, \alpha_{1,m}^L\big\}$ this case requires the concourse of the quasi-tau matrices H_n^R. We have chosen to constrain our treatment just to he more interesting first two cases.

In both situations we need the following technical result

Proposition 32. *For any matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ it holds that*

$$-Ab_n^{(2)} + A(a_n b_n + b_n d_n) - a_n A b_n = -A\big(b_{n+1} + b_n c_{n+1} b_n\big) + [A, a_n]b_n,$$
$$c_n^{(2)}A - c_n A a_n = \big(c_{n-1} + c_n b_{n-1} c_n\big)A - c_n[A, a_n].$$

Proof. It follows from (32) and(41). □

5.1. **The Fuchsian case.**

5.1.1. *Monodromy free condition.* Let us consider the choice

$$W(z) = W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + W_1 z. \tag{69}$$

Proposition 33. *For the Fuchsian case the matrix Hölder condition on the matrix of weights $w(\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbb{T}$, requires W_{-1} to be a diagonalizable matrix with integer eigenvalues.*

Proof. We follow [15, 95]. Let us take take $W(z) = W_{-1}z^{-1}$ the monodromy matrix is $M = \exp(2\pi \mathrm{i} W_{-1})$, and the fundamental solution is $S(z) = z^{W_{-1}} S_0$ where $S_0 \in \mathrm{GL}(N, \mathbb{C})$ is a non singular matrix, see §2.3 of [15]. Hence, we have $w(z) = z^{W_{-1}} S_0 w_0$, with $w_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$. Here, $z^{W_{-1}} := \exp(W_{-1}\log z)$ in a multivalued sense,[8] as we have that its matrix coefficients are linear combinations of multivalued functions $z^\lambda (\log z)^k$, where $k \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ and λ runs trough the eigenvalue of W_{-1}. To ensure that the corresponding matrix of weights $w(z)$ is single valued we require trivial monodromy and, therefore, W_{-1} should be diagonalizable with integer eigenvalues,

$$W_{-1} = P\Lambda_{-1}P^{-1}, \qquad \Lambda_{-1} = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N), \qquad P \in \mathrm{GL}(N, \mathbb{C}),$$

with $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Indeed, if this is the case we have

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(W_{-1}\log z) &= P\ \exp(\Lambda_{-1}\log z)P^{-1} \\ &= P\,\mathrm{diag}(z^{\lambda_1}, \dots, z^{\lambda_N})P^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is not multivalued because the eigenvalues λ_i are integers. Any meromorphically equivalent system corresponds to gauge transformations of the following type

$$\tilde{W}(z) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\Phi(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(\Phi(z)\big)^{-1} + \Phi(z) W_{-1} z^{-1} \big(\Phi(z)\big)^{-1}, \tag{70}$$

where $\Phi : \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\} \to \mathrm{GL}(N, \mathbb{C})$ is analytic and has at most a pole at the origin [15]. All equivalent systems have equivalent monodromies: $\tilde{M} = \Phi(z_0) M \big(\Phi(z_0)\big)^{-1}$. In particular, trivial monodromy $M = I_N$ is preserved after equivalence transformations. Thus, all the equivalent systems (70) have trivial monodromy. Following Theorem in §2.3 in [15] we know that all systems with a regular singularity at the origin are equivalent to a system with $W(z) = W_{-1}z^{-1}$. Consequently, all the cases we consider will be of the form $\tilde{W}_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + W_1 z + \cdots$, where $\tilde{W}_{-1}$ is diagonalizable with integer eigenvalues. □

5.1.2. *Derivation of the matrix discrete Painlevé system.* From

$$M_n(z) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\,X_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1} + X_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + W_1 z & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N z^{-1}\end{pmatrix}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1},$$

we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{[0]} = {} & \begin{pmatrix} W_{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N\end{pmatrix} + X^{(1)}\begin{pmatrix} W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} X^{(1)} \\ & + X_n^{(2)}\begin{pmatrix} W_1 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} W_1 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} X_n^{(2)} + \begin{pmatrix} W_1 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix}\big(X_n^{(1)}\big)^2 - X_n^{(1)}\begin{pmatrix} W_1 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} X_n^{(1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

which gives

$$W_{-1} + [a_n, W_0] + \big[a_n^{(2)}, W_1\big] + W_1\big((a_n)^2 + b_n c_n\big) - a_n W_1 a_n = \alpha_{1,n}^{L}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^\dagger, \tag{72}$$

$$-W_0 b_n - W_1 b_n^{(2)} + W_1(a_n b_n + b_n d_n) - a_n W_1 b_n = -\alpha_{1,n}^{L}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)H_n^R, \tag{73}$$

$$c_n W_0 + c_n^{(2)} W_1 - c_n W_1 a_n = -\big(H_{n-1}^R\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)\big(\alpha_{2,n}^R\big)^\dagger, \tag{74}$$

$$-nI_N - c_n W_1 b_n = \big(H_{n-1}^R\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)H_n^R. \tag{75}$$

[8] Note that its analytic continuation will have a logarithmic ramification ta the origin, see [15]

Theorem 4 (Fuchsian matrix discrete Painlevé II system)**.** *When the right logarithmic derivative of the matrix of measures is* $W(z) = W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + W_0 z$*, with* W_{-1} *a diagonalizable matrix with entire eigenvalues so that* (46) *is monodromy free, the corresponding Verblunsky coefficients solve to the following nonlinear matrix difference equations*

$$
\begin{aligned}
(76)\quad & W_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + W_1\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n-1)I_N\big), \\
& \qquad = W_1\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big) + \Big[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big]\alpha^{L}_{1,n}, \\
(77)\quad & \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}W_1 - \big(W_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} \\
& \qquad = \Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_1 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n+1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big],
\end{aligned}
$$

where $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$*.*

Proof. Equations (73) and (74) can be rewritten as follows

$$
\begin{aligned}
-W_0 b_n - W_1\big(b_{n+1} + b_n c_{n+1} b_n\big) + \big[W_1, a_n\big]b_n &= -\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)H^{R}_{n}, \\
c_n W_0 + \big(c_{n-1} + c_n b_{n-1} c_n\big)W_1 - c_n[W_1, a_n] &= -\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Proposition 32 and equation (38) we find out that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -W_0\alpha_n - W_1\Big(\alpha^{L}_{n+1}H^{R}_{n}\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1} - \alpha^{L}_{n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{n}\Big) + \big[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\big]\alpha^{L}_{n} \\
& \qquad = -\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n-1)I_N\big), \\
& -\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 - \Big(H^{R}_{n}\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_1 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n+1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}] \\
& \qquad = -\big(W_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger}.
\end{aligned}
$$

That reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -W_0\alpha_n - W_1\Big(\alpha^{L}_{n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{n} - \alpha^{L}_{n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{n}\Big) + \big[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\big]\alpha^{L}_{n} \\
& \qquad = -\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n-1)I_N\big), \\
& -\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 - \Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_1 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n+1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}] \\
& \qquad = -\big(W_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger},
\end{aligned}
$$

and the result follows. □

Proposition 34. *The matrix discrete Painlevé II system, given by equations* (76) *and* (76)*, imply the equations obtained from* (72) *and* (75) *by a discrete derivative in* n*.*

Proof. Consider the matrix discrete Painlevé II system (73) and (74). Let us show that (73) & (74) ⇒ (72)′, where (72)′ refers to the difference of the equation (72) at sites $n+1$ and n,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -[a_{n+1} - a_n, W_0] - \big((a_{n+1} - a_n)a_n - b_n c_n\big)W_1 \\
& \quad - W_1\big((a_{n+1})^2 + b_{n+1}c_{n+1} - (a_n)^2 - b_n c_n - (a_{n+1} - a_n)a_n + b_n c_n\big) + a_{n+1}W_1 a_{n+1} - a_n W_1 a_n \\
& \qquad = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - nI_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(W_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger},
\end{aligned}
$$

where (41) have been used. If we introduce (32) in the previous relation we get

$$\begin{aligned}&[b_n c_{n+1}, W_0] + \big(b_n c_{n+1} a_n + b_n c_n\big) W_1 \\ &\quad - W_1\big(-a_{n+1} b_n c_{n+1} + b_{n+1} c_{n+1}\big) + a_{n+1} W_1 a_{n+1} - a_n W_1 a_n \\ &\qquad = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger}.\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

The difference of equation (73), multiplied on its right by c_{n+1}, with (74), evaluated at $n+1$ and left multiplied by b_n gives, once (41) is used again,

$$\begin{aligned}&- W_1\big(b_{n+1} - (a_{n+1} - a_n) b_n\big) c_{n+1} + \big[W_1, a_n\big] b_n c_{n+1} \\ &\quad + \big[b_n c_{n+1}, W_0\big] + b_n\big(c_n - c_{n+1}(a_{n+1} - a_n)\big) W_1 - b_n c_{n+1}\big[W_1, a_{n+1}\big] \\ &\qquad = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger},\end{aligned}$$

and recalling (32) we conveniently express it as

$$\begin{aligned}&- W_1\big(b_{n+1} c_{n+1} - a_{n+1} b_n c_{n+1}\big) + a_n W_1 (a_{n+1} - a_n) \\ &\quad + \big[b_n c_{n+1}, W_0\big] + \big(b_n c_n + b_n c_{n+1} a_n\big) W_1 + (a_{n+1} - a_n) W_1 a_{n+1} \\ &\qquad = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger}.\end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Therefore, and comparison of (78) with (79) gives the desired result.

Let us show that (73) & (74) $\Rightarrow$ (75)', where (75)' is the discrete derivative of (75):

$$I_N + c_{n+1} W_1 b_{n+1} - c_n W_1 b_n = \big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big) H^{R}_{n} - \big(H^{R}_{n}\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big) H^{R}_{n+1}.$$

Using (38) it can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned}&I_N - (H^{R}_{n})^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} W_1 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+2} H^{R}_{n+1} + (H^{R}_{n-1})^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} W_1 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} H^{R}_{n} \\ &\qquad = \big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big) H^{R}_{n} - \big(H^{R}_{n}\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big) H^{R}_{n+1},\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}&I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} W_1 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+2} H^{R}_{n+1} (H^{R}_{n})^{-1} + H^{R}_{n} (H^{R}_{n-1})^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} W_1 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} \\ &\qquad = H^{R}_{n}\big(H^{R}_{n-1}\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big) - \big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big) H^{R}_{n+1} (H^{R}_{n})^{-1},\end{aligned}$$

and simplifying we arrive to

$$\begin{aligned}&- \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} W_1 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+2}\Big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\Big) + \Big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} W_1 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} \\ &\qquad = -\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big) + \big(W_{-1} - (n+1) I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}.\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Equation (80) is gotten by multiplication on the left of (76), evaluated at site n+1, by $\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}$ and on the right (77) by $\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}$, and then taking its difference. □

5.1.3. *Reduction to a linear system.* A simplification, that leads to a linear system, is to take $W_1 = 0_N$, so that

Proposition 35. *For a matrix of weights with right logarithmic derivative given by $W(z) = W_{-1} z^{-1} + W_0$, where W_{-1} is a diagonalizable matrix with eigenvalues being strictly negative integers and W_0 is not singular, the Verblunsky coefficients are subject to the system of equations*

$$\big[\alpha^{L}_{1,n}(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1})^{\dagger}, W_0\big] = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n-1) I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}, \tag{81}$$

$$W_0 \alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big), \tag{82}$$

$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} W_0 = \big(W_{-1} - n I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}, \tag{83}$$

$$-n\big(I_N - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big)^{-1} = W_{-1} - n I_N. \tag{84}$$

The solution of which is

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} &= (W_0)^{-n+1}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}\big(W_{-1}-I_N\big)\cdots\big(W_{-1}-(n-1)I_N\big),\\ \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} &= \big(W_{-1}-nI_N\big)^{-1}\cdots\big(W_{-1}-2I_N\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_0)^{n-1},\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

with initial values constrained by

$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,1} = W_{-1}\big(W_{-1}-I_N\big)^{-1}. \tag{86}$$

Proof. As preliminary condition we need to ensure that (43) with $W_{-1}z^{-1}+W_0$ gives a single valued weight, from Proposition 33 we see that is indeed the case. To proceed, we see that (81) is a consequence of (82) and (83). The linear system given by (82) and (83) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} &= (W_0)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1}-(n-1)I_N\big),\\ \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} &= \big(W_{-1}-nI_N\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}W_0.\end{aligned}$$

Then, a complete iteration leads to the solution (85). Observe that (84) implies that

$$\big[W_{-1},\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big] = 0_N$$

and, consequently, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} &= \big(W_{-1}-nI_N\big)^{-1}\cdots\big(W_{-1}-2I_N\big)^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}\big(W_{-1}-I_N\big)\cdots\big(W_{-1}-(n-1)I_N\big)\\ &= \big(W_{-1}-nI_N\big)^{-1}\big(W_{-1}-I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(W_{-1}-nI_N\big)\big(I_N-\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big) &= W_{-1}-nI_N-\big(W_{-1}-nI_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\\ &= -nI_N+W_{-1}-\big(W_{-1}-I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we derive the constraint (86) for the first Verblunsky coefficients. □

5.2. **The non-Fuchsian case.** A more involved example is given by a logarithmic derivative of the matrix of weights of the following type

$$W(z) = W_{-2}z^{-2}+W_{-1}z^{-1}+W_0.$$

5.2.1. *Monodromy free and Stokes phenomena.* According to [57], Proposition 1.1, when W_{-2} is diagonalizable with N different eigenvalues

$$W_{-2} = P\Lambda_{-1}P^{-1},\qquad P\in GL(N,\mathbb{C}),\qquad \Lambda_{-1}=\operatorname{diag}(\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N),\qquad \alpha_i\neq\alpha_j,\qquad i\neq j,$$

the unique formal fundamental solution of (43) is

$$S(z) = P\Big(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sigma_k z^k\Big)\,e^{\Delta(z)},\qquad\qquad \Delta(z) := -\Lambda_{-1}z^{-1}+\Lambda_0\log z+\Lambda_1+\Lambda_2 z+\dots$$

with Λ_k and σ_k diagonal and off-diagonal matrices, respectively. These matrices σ_n are determined by the equations

$$\Lambda_n+[\sigma_{n+1},\Lambda_{-1}] = F_n,\qquad\qquad n\in\{0,1,2,\dots\} \tag{87}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}F_0 &= P^{-1}W_{-1}P,\\ F_1 &= P^{-1}W_0P+P^{-1}W_{-1}P\sigma_1-\sigma_1W_{-1}-\sigma_1,\\ F_n &= P^{-1}W_0P\sigma_{n-1}-\sigma_{n-1}\Lambda_1+P^{-1}W_{-1}P\sigma_n-\sigma_n\Lambda_0-n\sigma_n,\qquad n\in\{2,3,\dots\}.\end{aligned}$$

From (87) we can get uniquely and recursively all terms in the formal expansion, as the operator $\operatorname{ad}_{\Lambda_{-1}}$ is invertible in the space of off-diagonal matrices, in fact a polynomial in $\big(\operatorname{ad}_{\Lambda_{-1}}\big|_{\text{off}}\big)^{-1} = P\big(\operatorname{ad}_{\Lambda_{-1}}\big|_{\text{off}}\big)$. For example, $\Lambda_0 = \Big(P^{-1}W_{-1}P\Big)_{\text{diag}}$ and $\sigma_1 = P\big(\operatorname{ad}_{\Lambda_{-1}}\big|_{\text{off}}\big)\Big(P^{-1}W_{-1}P\Big)_{\text{off}}$, where we are projecting in the spaces of diagonal and off-diagonal matrices. Thus, multivaluedness of the weight $w(z)$ is formally avoided when

the diagonal elements are integers, $(P^{-1}W_{-1}P)_{i,i} \in \mathbb{Z}$, for $i \in \{1,\dots,N\}$. However, the Stokes phenomena, i.e., the existence of sectors (delimited by the Stokes rays which are determined by the conditions $\mathrm{Re}((\alpha_j - \alpha_i)z^{-1}) = 0$) where the formal solution is asymptotic to the genuine fundamental matrix can not be avoided and a further study is needed.

5.2.2. *The non-Fuchsian matrix discrete Painlevé system and the Heisenberg algebra.* We have seen that matrix discrete Painlevé II system (93) and (94) emerges naturally when the logarithmic derivative of the matrix of measures is $W(z) = W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0$. Let us mention an explicit example of a matrix of measures whose right logarithmic derivative is of the mentioned type. However, in opposition with the previous discussion W_{-2} is not diagonalizable. The matrix of weights is of Freud type and has the form

$$w(z) = \exp(V(z)), \qquad V(z) = -W_{-2}z^{-1} + W_0 z,$$

where $W_{-2}, W_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ are matrices such that with $W_{-1} = [W_{-2}, W_0]$ conform a Heisenberg algebra

$$[W_{-2}, W_{-1}] = 0_N \qquad [W_0, W_{-1}] = 0_N, \qquad [W_{-2}, W_0] = W_{-1}.$$

Indeed, we can compute the logarithmic right derivative with the aid of the formula

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\, w(z)}{\mathrm{d}\, z}(w(z))^{-1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(j+1)!}\big(\mathrm{ad}_{V(z)}\big)^j\Big(\frac{\mathrm{d}\, V(z)}{\mathrm{d}\, z}\Big),$$

where $\mathrm{ad}_A(B) = [A, B]$ and get

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\, w(z)}{\mathrm{d}\, z}(w(z))^{-1} = W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0.$$

Observe that in this case the matrices W_{-2} and W_0 must be nilpotent, and therefore not diagonalizable.

5.2.3. *Derivation of the matrix discrete Painlevé II system.* We have

$$M_n(z) = \frac{\mathrm{d}\, X_n(z)}{\mathrm{d}\, z}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1} + X_n(z)\begin{pmatrix} W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N z^{-1}\end{pmatrix}\big(X_n(z)\big)^{-1},$$

and we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} M_n^{[0]} = & -X_n^{(1)} + \begin{pmatrix} W_{-2} & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} + X_n^{(1)}\begin{pmatrix} W_{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} W_{-1} & 0_N \\ 0_N & -nI_N\end{pmatrix}X_n^{(1)} \\ & + X_n^{(2)}\begin{pmatrix} W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix}X_n^{(2)} + \begin{pmatrix} W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix}(X_n^{(1)})^2 - X_n^{(1)}\begin{pmatrix} W_0 & 0_N \\ 0_N & 0_N\end{pmatrix}X_n^{(1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

Consequently,

$$-a_n + W_{-2} + [a_n, W_{-1}] + \big[a_n^{(2)}, W_0\big] + W_0\big((a_n)^2 + b_n c_n\big) - a_n W_0 a_n = \alpha_{1,n}^{L} W_{-2}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}, \tag{89}$$

$$-b_n - (W_{-1} + nI_N)b_n - W_0 b_n^{(2)} + W_0(a_n b_n + b_n d_n) - a_n W_0 b_n = -\alpha_{1,n}^{L} W_{-2} H_n^{R}, \tag{90}$$

$$-c_n + c_n(W_{-1} + nI_N) + c_n^{(2)} W_0 - c_n W_0 a_n = -\big(H_{n-1}^{R}\big)^{-1} W_{-2}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}, \tag{91}$$

$$-d_n - c_n W_0 b_n = \big(H_{n-1}^{R}\big)^{-1} W_{-2} H_n^{R}. \tag{92}$$

Theorem 5 (A non-Fuchsian matrix discrete Painlevé II system)**.** *When the right logarithmic derivative of the matrix of measures is $W(z) = W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0$, with $W(z)$ such that* (46) *is monodromy free, the corresponding Verblunsky coefficients provide solutions to the following nonlinear matrix difference equations*

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big)\alpha_{1,n}^{L} + W_0\alpha_{1,n+1}^{L} - \alpha_{1,n-1}^{L} W_{-2} \\ &\qquad = W_0\Big(\alpha_{1,n+1}^{L}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha_{1,n}^{L} + \alpha_{1,n}^{L}\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha_{1,n}^{L}\Big) + \Big[W_0, \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha_{1,m}^{L}\big(\alpha_{2,m-1}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\Big]\alpha_{1,n}^{L}, \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big) + \big(\alpha_{2,n-1}^{R}\big)^{\dagger} W_0 - W_{-2}\big(\alpha_{2,n+1}^{R}\big)^{\dagger} \\ &\qquad = \Big(\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha_{1,n}^{L}\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}^{R}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha_{1,n+1}^{L}\big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_0 + \big(\alpha_{2,n}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\Big[W_0, \sum_{m=1}^{n+1}\alpha_{1,m}^{L}\big(\alpha_{2,m-1}^{R}\big)^{\dagger}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

where $n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$.

Proof. Proposition 32 allows us for expressing (90) and (91) as follows

$$(W_{-1} + nI_N)b_{n-1} + W_0\big(b_n + b_{n-1}c_nb_{n-1}\big) = \alpha^L_{1,n-1}W_{-2}H^R_{n-1} + \big[W_0, a_{n-1}\big]b_{n-1},$$
$$c_{n+1}(W_{-1} + nI_N) + \big(c_n + c_{n+1}b_nc_{n+1}\big)W_0 = -\big(H^R_n\big)^{-1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger + c_{n+1}\big[W_0, a_{n+1}\big].$$

Then,

$$(W_{-1} + nI_N)\alpha^L_{1,n} + W_0\alpha^L_{1,n+1}H^R_n\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1} - W_0\alpha^L_{1,n}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n} = \alpha^L_{1,n-1}W_{-2} + \big[W_0, a_{n-1}\big]\alpha^L_{1,n},$$
$$\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger(W_{-1} + nI_N) + H^R_n(H^R_{n-1})^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger W_0 - \big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger W_0$$
$$= W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger + \big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\big[W_0, a_{n+1}\big],$$

and we get the result. □

Proposition 36. *The matrix discrete Painlevé II system, given by equations* (93) *and* (94)*, imply the equations obtained from* (89) *and* (92) *by a discrete derivative in* n.

Proof. We will consider the matrix discrete Painlevé II system written in the equivalent form (90) and (91). We first show the implication: (90) & (91) $\Rightarrow$ (89)′. The difference of the equations (89) at $n+1$ and n gives

$$(a_{n+1} - a_n) - [a_{n+1} - a_n, W_{-1}] - \big((a_{n+1} - a_n)a_n - b_nc_n\big)W_0$$
$$- W_0\big((a_{n+1})^2 + b_{n+1}c_{n+1} - (a_n)^2 - b_nc_n - (a_{n+1} - a_n)a_n + b_nc_n\big) + a_{n+1}W_0a_{n+1} - a_nW_0a_n$$
$$= \alpha^L_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger - \alpha^L_{1,n+1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger,$$

where we have used (41). If we introduce (32) in the previous relation we get

(95)
$$- b_nc_{n+1} + [b_nc_{n+1}, W_{-1}] + \big(b_nc_{n+1}a_n + b_nc_n\big)W_0$$
$$- W_0\big(-a_{n+1}b_nc_{n+1} + b_{n+1}c_{n+1}\big) + a_{n+1}W_0a_{n+1} - a_nW_0a_n = \alpha^L_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger - \alpha^L_{1,n+1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger.$$

The difference of equation (90), multiplied on its right by c_{n+1}, with (91), evaluated at $n+1$ and left multiplied by b_n, gives

$$- W_0\big(b_{n+1} - (a_{n+1} - a_n)b_n\big)c_{n+1} + \big[W_0, a_n\big]b_nc_{n+1}$$
$$- b_nc_{n+1} + \big[b_nc_{n+1}, W_{-1}\big] + b_n\big(c_n - c_{n+1}(a_{n+1} - a_n)\big)W_0 - b_nc_{n+1}\big[W_0, a_{n+1}\big]$$
$$= \alpha^L_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger - \alpha^L_{1,n+1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger,$$

which after some cleaning and the use of (32) leads to

(96)
$$- W_0\big(b_{n+1}c_{n+1} - a_{n+1}b_nc_{n+1}\big) + a_nW_0(a_{n+1} - a_n)$$
$$- b_nc_{n+1} + \big[b_nc_{n+1}, W_{-1}\big] + \big(b_nc_n + b_nc_{n+1}a_n\big)W_0 + (a_{n+1} - a_n)W_0a_{n+1}$$
$$= \alpha^L_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger - \alpha^L_{1,n+1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger.$$

Therefore, and comparison of (95) with (96) gives the desired result.

We now prove the implication: (90) & (91) $\Rightarrow$ (92)′. The discrete derivative of (92) gives

$$d_{n+1} - d_n + c_{n+1}W_0b_{n+1} - c_nW_0b_n = \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}W_{-2}H^R_n - \big(H^R_n\big)^{-1}W_{-2}H^R_{n+1}.$$

Now, using (41) and using (40), let us write this equation in an equivalent form,

$$- (H^R_n)^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n+1}H^R_n - (H^R_n)^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger W_0\alpha^L_{1,n+2}H^R_{n+1} + (H^R_{n-1})^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger W_0\alpha^L_{1,n+1}H^R_n$$
$$= \big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}W_{-2}H^R_n - \big(H^R_n\big)^{-1}W_{-2}H^R_{n+1},$$

that is

$$- \big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n+1} - \big(\alpha^R_{2,n}\big)^\dagger W_0\alpha^L_{1,n+2}H^R_{n+1}(H^R_n)^{-1} + H^R_n(H^R_{n-1})^{-1}\big(\alpha^R_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger W_0\alpha^L_{1,n+1}$$
$$= H^R_n\big(H^R_{n-1}\big)^{-1}W_{-2} - W_{-2}H^R_{n+1}(H^R_n)^{-1},$$

and after some cleaning reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
(97)\quad &-\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}+\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}W_0\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}-\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}W_0\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}+\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}.\\
&=\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}W_0\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+2}-\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}W_0\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}+W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n+1}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, we manipulate the matrix discrete Painlevé system. Let us multiply on the left of (93) by $\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}$ and on the right (94) by $\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}$, and then takes its difference to get (97). □

5.2.4. *Reduction to a linear system.* A simplification is to take $W_0=0_{\mathrm{N}}$, and then a new linear system for the Verblusnky coefficients appears

Proposition 37. *When $W(z)=W_{-2}z^{-2}+W_{-1}z^{-1}$ the Verblunsky coefficients are subject to*

$$
(98)\qquad -\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1})^{\dagger}+[\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1})^{\dagger},W_{-1}]=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}-\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n-1}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger},
$$

$$
(99)\qquad (W_{-1}+(n+1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2},
$$

$$
(100)\qquad \left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+(n-1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})=W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}
$$

$$
(101)\qquad \left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}=-W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}+\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n-1}W_{-2}.
$$

whose general solution, when $W_{-1}+n\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}}$, for $n\in\{1,2,\dots\}$ and W_{-2} are non singular matrices, is given by

$$
(102)\qquad
\begin{aligned}
\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}&=(W_{-1}+n\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})^{-1}\cdots(W_{-1}+2\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})^{-1}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,1}(W_{-2})^{n-1},\\
\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}&=(W_{-2})^{-n+1}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,1}\right)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})\cdots(W_{-1}+(n-1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}}),
\end{aligned}
$$

in terms of the first Verblunsky coefficients $\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,1}\right)^{\dagger}$ and $\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,1}$.

Proof. The system (89), (90), (91) and (92) simplifies to

$$
\begin{aligned}
-a_n+W_{-2}+[a_n,W_{-1}]&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger},\\
-(W_{-1}+(n+1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})b_n&=-\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n,\\
c_n(W_{-1}+(n-1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})&=-\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}\\
-d_n&=\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n,
\end{aligned}
$$

when $W_0=0_{\mathrm{N}}$. In this more simple case, we can rewrite the system by performing a discrete derivation (a difference)

$$
\begin{aligned}
-(a_n-a_{n-1})+[a_n-a_{n-1},W_{-1}]&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}-\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n-1}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger},\\
(W_{-1}+(n+1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})b_n&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n,\\
c_n(W_{-1}+(n-1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})&=-\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger},\\
-(d_n-d_{n-1})&=\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n-\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-2}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, we use

$$
\begin{aligned}
a_n-a_{n-1}&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1})^{\dagger}, & b_n&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n\\
c_n&=-(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1})^{-1}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}, & d_n-d_{n-1}&=-(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1})^{-1}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

to get

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1})^{\dagger}+[\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1})^{\dagger},W_{-1}]&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger}-\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n-1}W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger},\\
(W_{-1}+(n+1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n+1}&=\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}W_{-2},\\
\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+(n-1)\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{N}})&=W_{-2}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n}\right)^{\dagger},\\
(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1})^{-1}\left(\alpha^{\mathrm{R}}_{2,n-1}\right)^{\dagger}\alpha^{\mathrm{L}}_{1,n}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}&=\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_n-\left(\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-2}\right)^{-1}W_{-2}\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{R}}_{n-1},
\end{aligned}
$$

and (98),(99), (100) and (101) follow.

Then, we can write (99) and (100) as

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} &= (W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2},\\ \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} &= (W_{-2})^{-1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N),\end{aligned}$$

which iterated leads to the solution (102). From here we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} &= (W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1}\cdots(W_{-1}+2I_N)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+I_N)\cdots(W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N),\\ \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} &= (W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1}\cdots(W_{-1}+2I_N)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+I_N)\cdots(W_{-1}+(n-2)I_N)\end{aligned}$$

and, consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)) &= \alpha^{L}_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger},\\ (W_{-1}+nI_N)\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} &= \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger},\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)) - (W_{-1}+nI_N)\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} = \alpha^{L}_{1,n}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}$$

and (98) is identically satisfied.

Now, from (102) we find

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} &= (W_{-2})^{-n+2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+I_N)(W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)^{-1}(W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}(W_{-2})^{n-1},\\ W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} &= (W_{-2})^{-n+2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+I_N)(W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}(W_{-2})^{n-1},\\ \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2} &= (W_{-2})^{-n+2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+I_N)(W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)^{-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,1}(W_{-2})^{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} - \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2} = (W_{-2})^{-n+2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,1}\big)^{\dagger}(W_{-1}+I_N)\mathcal{W}_n\alpha^{L}_{1,1}(W_{-2})^{n-1},$$

with

$$\mathcal{W}_n := (W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)^{-1}(W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1} + (W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1} - (W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)^{-1}.$$

But, let us notice that we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_n &= (W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N)^{-1}(W_{-1}+nI_N)^{-1}\big(I_N + (W_{-1}+(n-1)I_N) - (W_{-1}+nI_N)\big)\\ &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

and therefore (101) is also identically satisfied for Verblunsky coefficients as in (102). □

5.3. **Discussion on the matrix discrete Painlevé II systems. Locality.** We now compare the two matrix discrete Painlevé II systems we have obtained. For the reader convenience we write the equations again. First, for the Fuchsian case $W(z) = W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0 + W_1 z$, the matrix discrete Painlevé II system, given in (76) and (77), is

$$\begin{aligned}&W_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + W_1\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1}-(n-1)I_N\big)\\ &\qquad = W_1\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big) + \Big[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big]\alpha^{L}_{1,n},\\ &\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}W_1 - \big(W_{-1}-(n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger}\\ &\qquad = \Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_1 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big[W_1, \sum_{m=1}^{n+1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big].\end{aligned}$$

Second, for the non-Fuchsian case $W(z) = W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0$, the matrix discrete Painlevé II system, given in (93) and (94), reads

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big)\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + W_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2} \\
&\qquad = W_0\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big) + \Big[W_0, \sum_{m=1}^{n-1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big]\alpha^{L}_{1,n}, \\
&\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big) + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 - W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} \\
&\qquad = \Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_0 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big[W_0, \sum_{m=1}^{n+1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

We see that they are almost the same system. In fact, the nonlinear term are in complete correspondence by $W_1 \to W_0$. However, the linear terms are not. For example, we have terms like $(n-1)\alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}$ for the Fuchsian scenario and of the form $n\alpha^{L}_{1,n}$ for the non-Fuchsian one, spoiling a complete correspondence.

5.3.1. *Local matrix discrete Painlevé II systems.* These matrix discrete Painlevé II systems present cubic terms in the Verblunsky coefficients $\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}$ and $\alpha^{L}_{1,n}$, being all these terms local, in the sense that they involve nearby neighbors (the Verblunsky matrices at the sites $n-1$, n and $n+1$), but for the last commutator in the RHS.

Definition 21. *In the matrix discrete Painlevé II systems given in* (76) *and* (77)*, or in* (93) *and* (94) *we call non local terms those terms of the form*

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n\pm1}\alpha^{L}_{1,m}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,m-1}\big)^{\dagger}.$$

When these terms are absent we say that we have local matrix discrete Painlevé II systems. These systems are

(103)
$$W_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + W_1\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n-1)I_N\big) = W_1\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big),$$

(104)
$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}W_1 - \big(W_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} = \Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_1,$$

in the Fuchsian case, while for the non-Fuchsian case they are

(105)
$$\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big)\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + W_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2} = W_0\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big),$$

(106)
$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big) + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 - W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} = \Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big)W_0.$$

Examples of local matrix discrete Painlevé II systems. We now discuss some cases where we find local matrix discrete Painlevé II systems:

(1) If we take, in each case, $W_1 = k_1 I_N$ (Fuchsian) or $W_0 = k_0 I_N$ (non-Fuchsian) with $k_1, k_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ the systems are local and read

$$W_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + k_1\alpha^{L}_{n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}\big(W_{-1} - (n-1)I_N\big) = k_1\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big),$$
$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}W_0 + k_1\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} - \big(W_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} = k_1\Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big),$$

and

$$\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big)\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + k_0\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1} - \alpha^{L}_{1,n-1}W_{-2} = k_0\Big(\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n} + \alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\Big),$$
$$\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\big(W_{-1} + nI_N\big) + k_0\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} - W_{-2}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n+1}\big)^{\dagger} = k_0\Big(\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n-1}\big)^{\dagger} + \big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\alpha^{L}_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha^{R}_{2,n}\big)^{\dagger}\Big),$$

respectively.

(2) Two examples with locality, and in which we can ensure that we have an appropriate matrix of measures follow.
   (a) A first one is to take $W_{-1} = k_{-1}I_N$, $k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, then the matrix of weights
   $$w(z) = z^{k_{-1}} \exp(k_0 z) \exp(-W_{-2} z^{-1})$$
   leads to the following matrix discrete Painlevé II system
   $$(k_{-1}+n)\alpha^L_{1,n} + k_0\alpha^L_{1,n+1} - \alpha^L_{1,n-1}W_{-2} = k_0\Big(\alpha^L_{1,n+1}(\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n} + \alpha^L_{1,n}(\alpha^R_{2,n-1})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n}\Big),$$
   $$(k_{-1}+n)(\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger + k_0(\alpha^R_{2,n-1})^\dagger - W_{-2}(\alpha^R_{2,n+1})^\dagger = k_0\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n}(\alpha^R_{2,n-1})^\dagger + (\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n+1}(\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\Big).$$
   (b) A second one is
   $$w(z) = z^{k_{-1}} \exp(k_1 z^2/2) \exp(W_0 z)$$
   with $k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the corresponding matrix discrete Painlevé II equations are
   $$W_0\alpha^L_{1,n} + k_1\alpha^L_{1,n+1} - \alpha^L_{1,n-1}(k_{-1} - (n-1)I_N) = k_1\Big(\alpha^L_{1,n+1}(\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n} + \alpha^L_{1,n}(\alpha^R_{2,n-1})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n}\Big),$$
   $$(\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger W_0 + k_1(\alpha^R_{2,n-1})^\dagger - (k_{-1} - (n+1)I_N)(\alpha^R_{2,n+1})^\dagger = k_1\Big((\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n}(\alpha^R_{2,n-1})^\dagger + (\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\alpha^L_{1,n+1}(\alpha^R_{2,n})^\dagger\Big).$$

(3) There are more possibilities for local matrix discrete Painlevé II systems. For example, take the following matrices of weights

$w(z) = z^{k_{-1}} \exp(-k_{-2}z^{-1}) \exp(W_0 z)$	$k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,	$k_{-2} \in \mathbb{C}$,	$W_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$,
$w(z) = z^{k_{-1}} \exp(k_0 z) \exp(W_1 z^2/2)$,	$k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,	$k_0 \in \mathbb{C}$,	$W_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$,
$w(z) = z^{k_{-1}} \exp(W_0(az^{-1} + bz))$,	$k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,	$a, b \in \mathbb{C}$,	$W_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$,
$w(z) = z^{k_{-1}} \exp(W_1(az + bz^2))$,	$k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$,	$a, b \in \mathbb{C}$,	$W_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$.

This is so because in these four cases the commutativity $[w(z_1), w(z_2)] = 0_N$, for all $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{C}$, holds and, consequently, Proposition 12 is applicable.[9] Hence, the non local terms disappear.

(4) A more general scenario were these symmetry considerations are applicable, and the non local terms are set off, are
   (a) For the Fuchsian case we take the triple $W_{-1}, W_0, W_1 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ in an Abelian algebra, and W_{-1} a diagonalizable matrix with integer eigenvalues.
   (b) Similarly, for the non-Fuchsian case we choose triple $W_{-2}, W_{-1}, W_0 \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times N}$ in an Abelian algebra and W_{-1} a diagonalizable matrix with integer eigenvalues.

Theorem 6 (Local matrix discrete Painlevé II systems)**.** *The matrix discrete Painlevé II systems are local whenever*

(1) ***Fuchsian case****: we choose the triple of matrices $\{W_{-1}, W_0, W_1\}$ such that $[W_1, W_0] = [W_1, W_{-1}] = 0_N$, and such that for some nonzero complex number z_0 we have the commutativity $[W_1, w(z_0)] = 0_N$. The matrix of weights will have the form*
   $$w(z) = \exp(W_1 z^2/2)\tilde{w}(z)$$
   where the associated matrix of weights $\tilde{w}(z)$ is the unique solution to
   $$\frac{d\tilde{w}}{dz} = (W_{-1}z^{-1} + W_0)\tilde{w}, \qquad \tilde{w}(z) = w(z_0).$$

(2) ***Non-Fuchsian case****: we take the triple of matrices $\{W_{-2}, W_{-1}, W_0\}$ such that $[W_0, W_{-1}] = [W_1, W_{-2}] = 0_N$, and such that for some nonzero complex number z_0 we have the commutativity $[W_0, w(z_0)] = 0_N$. The matrix of weights will have the form*
   $$w(z) = \exp(W_0 z)\tilde{w}(z)$$

[9] We can argue also saying that $[w(z), W_0] = 0_N$, $\forall z \in \mathbb{C}$, in the first and third cases, and $[w(z), W_1] = 0_N$, $\forall z \in \mathbb{C}$, for the second and fourth cases, and we can apply Proposition 11.

where the associated matrix of weights $\tilde{w}(z)$ is the unique solution to

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\tilde{w}}{\mathrm{d}\,z} = (W_{-2}z^{-2} + W_{-1}z^{-1})\tilde{w}, \qquad \tilde{w}(z) = w(z_0).$$

Proof. We prove the Proposition just for the Fuchsian case; in the non-Fuchsian case the proof goes analogously. If W_1 commutes with the matrix of weights $w(z)$, Proposition 11 ensures that it commutes with the Verblunsky matrices, and the locality is achieved. But, $[W_1, W_0] = [W_1, W_{-1}] = 0_N$ are equivalent to $[W_1, W(z)] = 0_N$ for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$. Now, the Picard's method of successive approximations completes the argument, see [74]. Indeed, for a non singular point z_0, i.e., any non zero complex number, the matrix of weights $w(z)$ which satisfies (46) with $w(z_0) = w_0$ is the solution to the integral equation

$$w(z) = w_0 + \int_{z_0}^{z} W(s)w(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s.$$

Then, this solution can be obtained by the Picard iteration method

$$w_n(z) := w_0 + \int_{z_0}^{z} W(s)w_{n-1}(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s, \qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$$

as the limit

$$w_n(z) \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} w(z).$$

Consequently, if a matrix M commutes with $W(z)$ and the initial condition w_0 it also commutes with $w_n(z)$, for all n, and, therefore, with the limit $w(z) = \lim_{n\to\infty} w_n(z)$. Finally, the gauge transformation $w(z) \to \tilde{w}(z) := \exp(-W_1 z^2/2)w(z)$, reads

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}\,\tilde{w}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(\tilde{w}(z)\big)^{-1} &= -W_1 z + \exp(-W_1 z^2/2)\frac{\mathrm{d}\,w(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(w(z)\big)^{-1}\exp(W_1 z^2/2)\\ &= -W_1 z + \exp(-W_1 z^2/2)W(z)\exp(W_1 z^2/2),\\ &= W_0 + W_1 z.\end{aligned}$$

□

One could think that this condition leads to the Abelian triple discussed in the preliminary examples of local systems. But $[W_1, W_0] = [W_1, W_{-1}] = 0_N$ do not imply that $[W_0, W_{-1}] = 0_N$ that in turn gives, for the Fuchsian situation, the following form for the measure $w(z) = \exp(W_{-1}\log z + W_0 z + W_1 z^2/2)$. Now, we give two examples that are not an Abelian triple for the Fuchsian case (the non-Fuchsian case goes similarly).

(1) For $N = 2$ we choose

$$W_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad W_0 = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \qquad W_1 = k_1 I_2$$

where $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a, b, c, d, k \in \mathbb{C}$. This example fits in the first family we considered with W_1 proportional to the identity.

(2) Much more interesting is the following choice for $N = 3$. We pick

$$W_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_2 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad W_0 = \begin{pmatrix} e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b \\ 0 & c & d \end{pmatrix}, \qquad W_1 = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & k_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & k_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

with $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $a, b, c, d, e, k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{C}$. Here W_1 is not proportional to the identity but commutes with W_{-1} and W_0, and $[W_{-1}, W_0] \neq 0_3$. Obviously, this example can be generalized. These type of choices are relevant because fro then the commutativity $[w(z), w(z')] = 0_N$ for all $z, z' \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$ does not necessarily holds. Hence, the matrix Szegő polynomials and Verblunsky matrices do not necessarily form an Abelian set, which indeed happens if $[W_0, W{-}1] = 0_N$.

5.3.2. *The scalar case.* Finally, let us mention that in the scalar case, when $N = 1$, right and left indexes disappear and we get the following systems of equations

$$k_0\alpha_{1,n} + k_1\alpha_{1,n+1} - \alpha_{1,n-1}\big(k_{-1} - (n-1)I_N\big) = k_1\Big(\alpha_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n} + \alpha_{1,n}\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n}\Big),$$
$$k_0\big(\alpha_{2,n}\big)^\dagger + k_1\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger - \big(k_{-1} - (n+1)I_N\big)\big(\alpha_{2,n+1}\big)^\dagger = k_1\Big(\big(\alpha_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n}\big(\alpha_{2,n-1}\big)^\dagger + \big(\alpha_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\alpha_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}\big)^\dagger\Big),$$

for the Fuchsian case, which correspond to the complex weight

$$w(\zeta) = \zeta^{k_{-1}}\,e^{k_0\zeta + \frac{k_1}{2}\zeta^2}, \qquad k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, \qquad k_0, k_1 \in \mathbb{C}, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

This weight can not be reduced to a real weight, consequently this is a purely biorthogonal result as it not associated with any orthogonal reduction. For the non-Fuchsian case the system is

$$\big(k_{-1} + n\big)\alpha_{1,n} + k_0\alpha_{1,n+1} - k_{-2}\alpha_{1,n-1} = k_0\big(\alpha_{1,n+1}\alpha_{2,n}\alpha_{1,n} + \alpha_{2,n-1}\big(\alpha_{1,n}\big)^2\big),$$
$$\big(k_{-1} + n\big)\alpha_{2,n} + k_0\alpha_{2,n-1} - k_{-2}\alpha_{2,n+1} = k_0\big(\alpha_{2,n}\alpha_{1,n}\alpha_{2,n-1} + \alpha_{1,n+1}\big(\alpha_{2,n}\big)^2\big),$$

which corresponds to the complex measure

$$w(\zeta) = \zeta^{k_{-1}}\,e^{-k_{-2}\zeta^{-1} + k_0\zeta}, \qquad k_{-1} \in \mathbb{Z}, \qquad k_0, k_{-2} \in \mathbb{C}, \qquad \zeta \in \mathbb{T}.$$

Now, we do have a real reduction, with $k_0 = -k_{-2} = k \in \mathbb{R}$, $k_{-1} = 0$, and $\alpha_{1,n} = \alpha_{2,n} = \alpha_n$. Consequently, biothogonality reduces to orthogonality and we get the well known dPII equation

$$n\frac{\alpha_n}{1 - \big(\alpha_n\big)^2} + k(\alpha_{n+1} + \alpha_{n-1}) = 0.$$

This equation appeared in the context of unitary matrix models, see [104, 105], and in the study self-similarity reductions of the mKdV equation, see [100]. For a discussion of some interesting properties of this modified Bessel OPUC see [77] and for the corresponding integrable hierarchy see [36]. Notice that the Fuchsian case do not have any real reduction, and consequently we have just biorthogonal Szegő polynomials.

Appendix A. Fuchsian examples of matrices of weights for $N = 2$

We will study some examples for the Fuchsian case and $N = 2$ given by

$$W_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p + k \end{pmatrix}$$

with $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$.[10] Observe that for $k = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ we are dealing with resonant cases. With the aid of [116] we explore the cases $k = 1, 2, 3$ and get explicit examples of matrices of weights linked to the original assumption for the right logarithmic derivative. We obtain that if the coefficients of $W(z)$ lay in certain algebraic hypersurface of degree k in $\mathbb{C}^8$, the corresponding linear ODE system (46) has trivial monodromy. This construction works for larger k; we will obtain higher degree algebraic hypersurfaces for the constraints ensuring single-valuedness. Using the techniques of [116, 57] we can apply these ideas to the general situation $N \geqslant 3$.

A.1. $N = 2$ **and** $k = 1$**.** Let us assume that

$$W_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p + 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, so that

$$W(z) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p + 1 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{pmatrix} a_0 + a_1 z & b_0 + b_1 z \\ c_0 + c_1 z & d_0 + d_1 z \end{pmatrix}$$

[10] For $W_{-1} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} p+k & 0 \\ 0 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ a similar discussion can be carried out.

for some $(a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0, a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1)^\top \in \mathbb{C}^8$. We will study the the corresponding matrix of weights $w(z)$, which is a solution of (46). An equivalent system, obtained by a shearing transformation generated by

$$\mathcal{S}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & z^{-1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{107}$$

is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(1)}(z) &= \frac{\mathrm{d}\,\mathcal{S}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z}\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} + \mathcal{S}(z)W(z)\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ c_0 & p \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + W_0^{(1)} + W_1^{(1)} z + W_2^{(1)} z^2, \quad W_0^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & 0 \\ c_1 & d_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_1^{(1)} := \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_0 \\ 0 & d_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_2^{(1)} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

This case is not resonant anymore, we have get rid of it using the shearing transformation. Therefore, a fundamental solution to the associated differential system

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\,w^{(1)}(z)}{\mathrm{d}\,z} = W^{(1)}(z)w^{(1)}(z) \tag{109}$$

is of the form $w^{(1)}(z) = \Phi(z)z^{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ c_0 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right)}$ where Φ is analytic with a Taylor series convergent at the annulus $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$

$$\Phi(z) = I_N + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots.$$

Thus, to avoid multivalued functions we require

$$c_0 = 0,$$

so that the fundamental solution will have the form $w^{(1)}(z) = z^p \Phi(z)$.[11] Then, from (109) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= W_0^{(1)}, \\ \Phi_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\big(W_0^{(1)}\Phi_1 + W_1^{(1)}\big), \\ \Phi_3 &= \frac{1}{3}\big(W_0^{(1)}\Phi_2 + W_1^{(1)}\Phi_1 + W_2^{(1)}\big), \\ \Phi_4 &= \frac{1}{4}\big(W_0^{(1)}\Phi_3 + W_1^{(1)}\Phi_2 + W_2^{(1)}\Phi_1\big), \\ &\vdots \\ \Phi_{n+3} &= \frac{1}{n+3}\big(W_0^{(1)}\Phi_{n+2} + W_1^{(1)}\Phi_{n+1} + W_2^{(1)}\Phi_n\big), \qquad\qquad n \in \{1, 2, \dots\} \end{aligned}$$

We see that all coefficients are obtained recursively, and the first three coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= W_0^{(1)}, \\ \Phi_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\big((W_0^{(1)})^2 + W_1^{(1)}\big), \\ \Phi_3 &= \frac{1}{6}\big((W_0^{(1)})^3 + W_0^{(1)}W_1^{(1)} + 2W_1^{(1)}W_0^{(1)} + 2W_2^{(1)}\big). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the matrix of weights we get

$$\begin{aligned} w(z) &= \big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} w^{(1)}(z) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} z^p & 0 \\ 0 & z^{p+1} \end{pmatrix} \big(I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots\big) \end{aligned}$$

[11] This condition also appears naturally when one considers the meromorphic equivalent systems to $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)z^{-1}$. Indeed, if the equivalence is realized by $I_2 z^{-m} + \Phi_1 z^{-m+1} + \Phi_2 z^{-m+2} + \cdots$ we get that the equivalent, free monodromy system, have the form $\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p-m & 0 \\ 0 & p+1-m \end{smallmatrix}\right)z^{-1} + \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_1 & (p+2)b_1 \\ 0 & d_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right) + O(z)$, where $\Phi_1 = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_1 & b_1 \\ c_1 & d_1 \end{smallmatrix}\right)$.

A.2. $N = 2$ **and** $k = 2$**.** Let us assume that

$$W_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+2 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, so that

$$W(z) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+2 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{pmatrix} a_0 + a_1 z & b_0 + b_1 z \\ c_0 + c_1 z & d_0 + d_1 z \end{pmatrix}$$

for $(a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0, a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1)^\top \in \mathbb{C}^8$. As for $k = 1$, we perform a shearing transformation generated by $\mathcal{S}(z)$, see (107), and obtain

$$W^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ c_0 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + W_0^{(1)} + W_1^{(1)} z + W_2^{(1)} z^2,$$

where $W_0^{(1)}, W_1^{(1)}, W_2^{(1)}$ are given in (108). To continue with the simplification, we now perform the following diagonalization

$$\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{T} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ c_0 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} \mathcal{T}^{-1}, \qquad \mathcal{T} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ c_0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{110}$$

Consequently, the new matrix is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}^{(1)} &= \mathcal{T} W^{(1)} \mathcal{T}^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \tilde{W}_0^{(1)} + \tilde{W}_1^{(1)} z + \tilde{W}_2^{(1)} z^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}_0^{(1)} &:= \mathcal{T} W_0^{(1)} \mathcal{T}^{-1} & \tilde{W}_1^{(1)} &:= \mathcal{T} W_1^{(1)} \mathcal{T}^{-1} & \tilde{W}_2^{(1)} &:= \mathcal{T} W_2^{(1)} \mathcal{T}^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & 0 \\ c_0(a_0 - d_0) + c_1 & d_0 \end{pmatrix}, & &= \begin{pmatrix} a_1 - b_0 c_0 & b_0 \\ c_0(a_1 - d_1) - b_0 (c_0)^2 & b_0 c_0 + d_1 \end{pmatrix}, & &= \begin{pmatrix} -b_1 c_0 & b_1 \\ -b_1 (c_0)^2 & b_1 c_0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

After a second shearing transformation generated by $S(z)$ as in (107) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(2)}(z) &= \frac{d\,\mathcal{S}(z)}{d\,z} \big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} + \mathcal{S}(z) \tilde{W}^{(1)}(z) \big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ c_0(a_0 - d_0) + c_1 & p \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + W_0^{(2)} + W_1^{(2)} z + W_2^{(2)} z^2 + W_3^{(2)} z^3, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} W_0^{(2)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & 0 \\ c_0(a_1 - d_1) - b_0 (c_0)^2 & d_0 \end{pmatrix}, & W_1^{(2)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} a_1 - b_0 c_0 & 0 \\ -b_1 (c_0)^2 & b_0 c_0 + d_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ W_2^{(2)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} -b_1 c_0 & b_0 \\ 0 & b_1 c_0 \end{pmatrix}, & W_3^{(2)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

Thus, the matrix

$$w^{(2)}(z) = \mathcal{S}(z) \mathcal{T} \mathcal{S}(z) w(z)$$

satisfies an ODE of the form

$$\frac{d\,w^{(2)}(z)}{d\,z} = W^{(2)}(z) w^{(2)}(z),$$

which is resonance free. Thus, a fundamental solution is

$$w^{(2)}(z) = (I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots) z^{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ \vartheta_2 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right)}, \qquad \vartheta_2 := c_0(a_0 - d_0) + c_1.$$

Furthermore, to avoid a multivalued situation we impose to the coefficients of $W(z)$ to belong to the quadric in $\mathbb{C}^8$ determined by the equation

$$\vartheta_2 = c_0(a_0 - d_0) + c_1 = 0,$$

and the solution will be

$$w^{(2)}(z) = z^p(I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots).$$

The corresponding matrix of weights is

$$\begin{aligned} w(z) &= \big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1}\mathcal{T}^{-1}\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1}w^{(2)}(z) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} z^p & 0 \\ -c_0 z^{p+1} & z^{p+2} \end{pmatrix}(I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots), \end{aligned}$$

where the series converge at the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 &= W_0^{(2)}, \\ \Phi_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\big(W_0^{(2)}\Phi_1 + W_1^{(2)}\big), \\ \Phi_3 &= \frac{1}{3}\big(W_0^{(2)}\Phi_2 + W_1^{(2)}\Phi_1 + W_2^{(2)}\big), \\ \Phi_4 &= \frac{1}{4}\big(W_0^{(2)}\Phi_3 + W_1^{(2)}\Phi_2 + W_2^{(2)}\Phi_1 + W_3^{(2)}\big), \\ \Phi_5 &= \frac{1}{5}\big(W_0^{(2)}\Phi_4 + W_1^{(2)}\Phi_3 + W_2^{(2)}\Phi_2 + W_3^{(2)}\Phi_1\big), \\ &\vdots \\ \Phi_{n+4} &= \frac{1}{n+4}\big(W_0^{(2)}\Phi_{n+3} + W_1^{(2)}\Phi_{n+2} + W_2^{(2)}\Phi_{n+1} + W_3^{(2)}\Phi_n\big), \qquad n \in \{1,2,\dots\}. \end{aligned}$$

A.3. $N = 2$ **and** $k = 3$**.** Finally, let us assume that

$$W_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+3 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $p \in \mathbb{Z}$, and

$$W(z) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+3 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \begin{pmatrix} a_0 + a_1 z & b_0 + b_1 z \\ c_0 + c_1 z & d_0 + d_1 z \end{pmatrix}$$

for $(a_0, b_0, c_0, d_0, a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1)^\top \in \mathbb{C}^8$. As for $k = 2$, we perform a transformation generated by $S(z)TS(z)$, see (107) and (110), and get

$$W^{(2)}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ \vartheta_2 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + W_0^{(2)} + W_1^{(2)} z + W_2^{(2)} z^2 + W_3^{(2)} z^3$$

with coefficients given in (111). A further diagonalization

$$\begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} = \mathcal{T}^{(2)} \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ \vartheta_2 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} \big(\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\big)^{-1}, \qquad \mathcal{T}^{(2)} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \vartheta_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W}^{(2)} &= T^{(2)} W^{(2)} \big(T^{(2)}\big)^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ 0 & p+1 \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + \tilde{W}_0^{(2)} + \tilde{W}_1^{(2)} z + \tilde{W}_2^{(2)} z^2 + \tilde{W}_3^{(2)} z^3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}_0^{(2)} &:= \mathcal{T}^{(2)} A_0^{(2)} \big(\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\big)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & 0 \\ c_0(a_1-d_1) - b_0(c_0)^2 + \vartheta_2(a_0-d_0) & d_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\tilde{W}_1^{(2)} &:= \mathcal{T}^{(2)} W_1^{(2)} \big(\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\big)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 - b_0c_0 & 0 \\ -b_1(c_0)^2 + \vartheta_2(a_1-d_1-2b_0c_0) & b_0c_0 + d_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\tilde{W}_2^{(2)} &:= \mathcal{T}^{(2)} W_2^{(2)} \big(\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\big)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -b_1c_0 - \vartheta_2 b_0 & b_0 \\ -2\vartheta_2 b_1 c_0 - (\vartheta_2)^2 b_0 & b_1c_0 + \vartheta_2 b_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\tilde{W}_3^{(2)} &:= \mathcal{T}^{(2)} A_3^{(2)} \big(\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\big)^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} -\vartheta_2 b_1 & b_1 \\ -(\vartheta_2)^2 b_1 & \vartheta_2 b_1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, as a final step, we perform a third shearing transformation generated by $S(z)$, see(107), to get

$$\begin{aligned}
W^{(3)}(z) &= \frac{d\,\mathcal{S}(z)}{d\,z}\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} + \mathcal{S}(z)\tilde{W}^{(2)}(z)\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} p & 0 \\ \vartheta_3 & p \end{pmatrix} z^{-1} + W_0^{(3)} + W_1^{(3)} z + W_2^{(3)} z^2 + W_3^{(3)} z^3 + W_4^{(3)} z^4,
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
\vartheta_3 &:= c_0(a_1-d_1) - b_0(c_0)^2 + \vartheta_2(a_0-d_0) \\
&= c_0\Big((a_1-d_1) + (a_0-d_0)^2\Big) - b_0(c_0)^2 + c_1(a_0-d_0) \\
W_0^{(3)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & 0 \\ -b_1(c_0)^2 + \vartheta_2(a_1-d_1-2b_0c_0) & d_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
W_1^{(3)} &= \begin{pmatrix} a_1 - b_0c_0 & 0 \\ -2\vartheta_2 b_1 c_0 - (\vartheta_2)^2 b_0 & b_0c_0 + d_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
W_2^{(3)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} -b_1c_0 - \vartheta_2 b_0 & 0 \\ -(\vartheta_2)^2 b_1 & b_1c_0 + \vartheta_2 b_0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
W_3^{(3)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} -\vartheta_2 b_1 & b_0 \\ 0 & \vartheta_2 b_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
W_3^{(3)} &:= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

Hence, the matrix $w^{(3)}(z) = \mathcal{S}(z)\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\mathcal{S}(z)\mathcal{T}\mathcal{S}(z)w(z)$ satisfies the following non-resonant linear system of ODE

$$\frac{d\,w^{(3)}(z)}{d\,z} = W^{(3)}(z)w^{(3)}(z)$$

with a fundamental solution given by

$$w^{(2)}(z) = (I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots) z^{\left(\begin{smallmatrix} p & 0 \\ \vartheta_3 & p \end{smallmatrix}\right)}.$$

Furthermore, to avoid a multivalued situation we impose to the coefficients of $W(z)$ to lay in the cubic hypersurface

$$\vartheta_3 = c_0\Big((a_1-d_1) + (a_0-d_0)^2\Big) - b_0(c_0)^2 + c_1(a_0-d_0) = 0$$

and the solution is simplifies to $w^{(2)}(z) = z^p(I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots)$. Hence, the corresponding matrix of weights is

$$\begin{aligned}
w(z) &= \big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1}\mathcal{T}^{-1}\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1}\big(\mathcal{T}^{(2)}\big)^{-1}\big(\mathcal{S}(z)\big)^{-1} w^{(3)}(z) \\
&= \begin{pmatrix} z^p & 0 \\ -c_0 z^{p+1} - \vartheta_2 z^{p+2} & z^{p+3} \end{pmatrix} (I_2 + \Phi_1 z + \Phi_2 z^2 + \cdots),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_1 &= W_0^{(3)},\\
\Phi_2 &= \frac{1}{2}\big(W_0^{(3)}\Phi_1 + W_1^{(3)}\big),\\
\Phi_3 &= \frac{1}{3}\big(W_0^{(3)}\Phi_2 + W_1^{(3)}\Phi_1 + W_2^{(3)}\big),\\
\Phi_4 &= \frac{1}{4}\big(W_0^{(3)}\Phi_3 + W_1^{(3)}\Phi_2 + W_2^{(3)}\Phi_1 + W_3^{(3)}\big),\\
\Phi_5 &= \frac{1}{5}\big(W_0^{(3)}\Phi_4 + W_1^{(3)}\Phi_3 + W_2^{(3)}\Phi_2 + W_3^{(3)}\Phi_1 + W_4^{(3)}\big),\\
\Phi_6 &= \frac{1}{6}\big(W_0^{(3)}\Phi_5 + W_1^{(3)}\Phi_4 + W_2^{(3)}\Phi_4 + W_3^{(3)}\Phi_4 + W_4^{(3)}\Phi_1\big),\\
&\vdots\\
\Phi_{n+5} &= \frac{1}{n+5}\big(W_0^{(3)}\Phi_{n+4} + W_1^{(3)}\Phi_{n+3} + W_2^{(3)}\Phi_{n+2} + W_3^{(3)}\Phi_{n+1} + W_4^{(3)}\Phi_n\big), \qquad n \in \{1,2,\dots\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the series converge at the annulus $\mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$.

REFERENCES

[1] M. J. Ablowitz and P. A. Clarkson, *Solitons, Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Inverse Scattering*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes Series **149**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.

[2] M. J. Ablowitz, R. Halburd, and B. Herbst, *On the extension of the Painlevé property to difference equations*, Nonlinearity **13** (2000) 889-905.

[3] M. J. Ablowitz, and J. F. Ladik, *Nonlinear differential-difference equations*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **16** (1975) 598-603.

[4] M. J. Ablowitz and J. F. Ladik, *Nonlinear differential-difference equations and Fourier analysis*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **17** (1976) 1011-1018.

[5] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Generalized orthogonal polynomials, discrete KP and Riemann–Hilbert problems*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **207** (1999) 589-620.

[6] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Darboux transforms on band matrices, weights and associated polynomials*, International Mathematical Research Notices **18** (2001) 935-984.

[7] M. Adler and P. van Moerbeke, *Integrals over classical groups, random permutations, Toda and Toeplitz lattices*, Communications in Pure and Applied Mathematics **54** (2001) 153-205.

[8] M. Alfaro, *Una expresión de los polinomios ortogonales sobre la circunferencia unidad*, Actas III J.M.H.L. (Sevilla, 1974) 2 (1982) 1-8.

[9] C. Álvarez-Fernández, U. Fidalgo, and M. Mañas, *The multicomponent 2D Toda hierarchy: generalized matrix orthogonal polynomials, multiple orthogonal polynomials and Riemann–Hilbert problems*, Inverse Problems **26** (2010) 055009 (17 pp.)

[10] C. Álvarez-Fernández and M. Mañas, *Orthogonal Laurent polynomials on the unit circle, extended CMV ordering and 2D Toda type integrable hierarchies*, Advances in Mathematics **240** (2013) 132-193.

[11] C. Álvarez-Fernández and M. Mañas, *On the Christoffel–Darboux formula for generalized matrix orthogonal polynomials of multi-graded Hankel type*, Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications **418** (2014) 238-247.

[12] Carlos Álvarez-Fernández, Gerardo Ariznabarreta, Juan Carlos García-Ardila, Manuel Mañas, and Francisco Marcellán, *Christoffel transformations for matrix orthogonal polynomials in the real line and the non-Abelian 2D Toda lattice hierarchy*, International Mathematics Research Notices. (2016) doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnw027.

[13] Carlos Álvarez-Fernández, Gerardo Ariznabarreta, Juan Carlos García-Ardila, Manuel Mañas, and Francisco Marcellán, *Transformation theory and Christoffel formulas for matrix biorthogonal polynomials on the real line* , arXiv:1605.04617.

[14] M. Ambroladze, *On exceptional sets of asymptotics relations for general orthogonal polynomials*, Journal of Approximation Theory **82** (1995) 257-273.

[15] D. V. Anosov, S. Kh. Aranson, V. I. Arnold, I. U. Bronshtein, V. Z. Grines, and Yu. S Il'ashenko, *Ordinary Differential Equations and Smooth Dynamical Systems*, Springer, third edition, Berlin, 1997.

[16] D. V. Anosov and A. A. Bolibruch, *The Riemann-Hilbert Problem*, Vieweg Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1994

[17] A. I. Aptekarev and E. M. Nikishin,*The scattering problem for a discrete Sturm–Liouville operator*, Mathematics of the USSR Sbornik **49** (1984) 325-355.

[18] G. Ariznabarreta and M. Mañas, *Matrix orthogonal Laurent polynomials on the unit circle and Toda type integrable systems*, Advances in Mathematics **264** (2014) 396-464.

[19] J. Baik, *Riemann–Hilbert problems for last passage percolation* in *Recent Developments in Integrable Systems and Riemann–Hilbert Problems*, K. McLaughlin and X. Zhou, eds, Contemporary Mathematics **326** (2003) 1–21.

[20] J. Baik, P. Deift, and K. Johansson, *On the distribution of the length of the longest increasing subsequence of random permutations*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society **12** (1999) 1119–1178.

[21] D. Barrios, G. López, *Ratio asymptotics for orthogonal polynomials on arcs of the unit circle*, Constructive Approximation **15** (1999) 1-31.
[22] Yu. M. Berezanskii, *Expansions in eigenfunctions of self-adjoint operators*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **17**, American Mathematical Society, 1968.
[23] E. Berriochoa, A. Cachafeiro, and J. Garcia-Amor *Connection between orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle and bounded interval*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **177** (2005) 205-223.
[24] M. Bertola and M. Gekhtman, *Biorthogonal Laurent polynomials, Toeplitz determinants, minimal Toda orbits and isomonodromic tau functions*, Constructive Approximation **26** (2007) 383-430.
[25] G. D. Birkhoff, *Singular points of ordinary linear differential equations*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **10** (1909) 391-435.
[26] J. Borrego, M. Castro, and A. J. Durán, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials satisfying differential equations with recurrence coefficients having non-scalar limits*, Integral Transforms and Special Functions **23** (2012) 685-700.
[27] A. Bultheel, P. González-Vera, E. Hendriksen, and O.Njåstad, *Orthogonal rational functions*, Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics **5**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
[28] M. Cafasso, *Matrix biorthogonal polynomials on the unit circle and non-Abelian Ablowitz-Ladik hierarchy*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical & Theoretical **42** (2009) 365211.
[29] M. J. Cantero, L. Moral, and L. Velázquez, *Five-diagonal matrices and zeros of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle*, Linear Algebra and Applications **362** (2003) 29-56.
[30] M. J. Cantero, L. Moral, and L. Velázquez, *Differential properties of matrix orthogonal polynomials*, Journal of Concrete and Applicable Mathematics **3** (2008) 313-334.
[31] G. Cassatella-Contra and M. Mañas, *Riemann–Hilbert problems, matrix orthogonal polynomials and discrete matrix equations with singularity confinement*, Studies in Applied Mathematics **128** (2012) 252-274.
[32] G. Cassatella-Contra, M. Mañas, and P. Tempesta, *Singularity confinement for matrix discrete Painlevé equations*, Nonlinearity **27** (2014) 2321-2335.
[33] J. A. Cima, A. L. Matheson, and W. T. Ross, *The Cauchy Transform*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **125**, American Mathematical Society, 2006.
[34] K. Clancey and I. Gohberg, *Factorization of Matrix Functions and Singular Integral Operators*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications **3**, Springer Basel AG, Basel, 1981.
[35] P. A. Clarkson and K. Jordaan, *The Relationship Between Semiclassical Laguerre Polynomials and the Fourth Painlevé Equation*, Constructive Approximation **29** (2014) 223-254.
[36] C. Creswell and N. Joshi, *The discrete first, second and thirty-fourth Painlevé hierarchies*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical & General **32** (1999) 655-669.
[37] R. Cruz-Barroso and S. Delvaux, *Orthogonal Laurent polynomials on the unit circle and snake-shaped matrix factorizations*, Journal of Approximation Theory **161** (2009) 65-87.
[38] R. Cruz-Barroso and P. González-Vera, *A Christoffel–Darboux formula and a Favard's theorem for Laurent orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **179** (2005) 157-173.
[39] D. Damanik, A. Pushnitski, and B. Simon, *The Analytic Theory of Matrix Orthogonal Polynomials*, Surveys in Approximation Theory **4** (2008) 1-85.
[40] E. Daems and A. B. J. Kuijlaars, *Multiple orthogonal polynomials of mixed type and non-intersecting Brownian motions*, Journal of Approximation Theory **146** (2007) 91–114.
[41] E. Daems, A. B. J. Kuijlaars, and W. Veys, *Asymptotics of non-intersecting Brownian motions and a* 4×4 *Riemann–Hilbert problem*, Journal of Approximation Theory **153** (2008) 225–256.
[42] D. Dai and A. B. J. Kuijlaars, *Painlevé IV asymptotics for orthogonal polynomials with respect to a modified Laguerre weight*, Studies in Applied Mathematics **122** (2009) 29–83.
[43] P. A. Deift, *Orthogonal Polynomials and Random Matrices: A Riemann–Hilbert Approach*, Courant Lecture Notes **3**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2000.
[44] P. A. Deift, *Riemann–Hilbert methods in the theory of orthogonal polynomials, in Spectral Theory and Mathematical Physics: a Festschrift in Honor of Barry Simon's 60th Birthday*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics **76**, 715–740, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007.
[45] P. A. Deift and D. Gioev, *Random matrix theory: invariant ensembles and universality*, Courant Lecture Notes in Mathematics**18**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2009.
[46] P. A. Deift and X. Zhou, *A steepest descent method for oscillatory Riemann–Hilbert problems. Asymptotics for the MKdV equation*, Annals of Mathematics **137** (1993) 295–368.
[47] P. A. Deift and X. Zhou, *Long-time asymptotics for solutions of the NLS equation with initial data in a weighted Sobolev space*, Communications in Pure Applied Mathematics **56** (2003) 1029–1077.
[48] A. J. Durán and F. J. Grünbaum, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials, scalar-type Rodrigues' formulas and Pearson equations*, Journal of Approximation Theory **134** (2005) 267-280.
[49] A. J. Durán and F. J. Grünbaum, *Structural formulas for orthogonal matrix polynomials satisfying second order differential equations, I*, Constructive Approximation **22** (2005) 255-271.
[50] A. J. Durán, *Matrix inner product having a matrix symmetric second order differential operator*, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics **27** (1997) 585-600.
[51] A. J. Durán and F. J. Grünbaum,, *Orthogonal matrix polynomials satisfying second order differential equations*, International Mathematics Research Notices **10** (2004) 461-484.

[52] A. J. Durán and M. D. de la Iglesia, *Second order differential operators having several families of orthogonal matrix polynomials as eigenfunctions*, International Mathematics Research Notices **2008** (2008).
[53] L.C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions* , revised edition, CRC Press, 2015.
[54] L. Faybusovich and M. Gekhtman, *On Schur flows*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Geneneral **32** (1999) 4671-4680.
[55] L. Faybusovich and M. Gekhtman *Elementary Toda orbits and integrable lattices*, Journal of Mathematical Physics **41** (2000) 2905-2921.
[56] L. Faybusovich and M. Gekhtman, *Inverse moment problem for elementary co-adjoint orbits*, Inverse Problems **17** (2001), 1295-1306.
[57] A. S. Fokas, A. R. Its, A. A. Kapaev, and V. Yu. Novokshenov, *Painlevé Transcendents. The Riemann–Hilbert Approach*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs **128**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2006.
[58] A. S. Fokas, A. R. Its, and A. V. Kitaev, *The isomonodromy approach to matrix models in 2D quantum gravity*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **147** (1992) 395-430.
[59] G. Freud, *On the coefficients in the recursion formulae of orthogonal polynomials,* Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy Section A **76** (1976) 1–6.
[60] G. Freud, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest and Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1971, 1985.
[61] P. García and F. Marcellán, *On zeros of regular orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle*, Annales Polonici Mathematici **58** (1993) 287-298.
[62] W. Gautschi, *Orthogonal Polynomials:computation and approximation*, Oxford University Press, New York, 2004.
[63] Ya. L. Geronimus, *Polynomials orthogonal on a circle and their applications, Series and Approximations*, American Mathematical Society Translations, series 1, vol. 3, Providence, RI, 1962, 1-78.
[64] F. D. Gakhov, *Boundary Value Problems*, Dover Publications, Inc. New York, 1990.
[65] I. M. Gelfand, S. Gelfand, V. S. Retakh, and R. Wilson, *Quasideterminants*, Advances in Mathematics **193** (2005) 56-141.
[66] I. M. Gelfand, D. Krob, A. Lascoux, B. Leclerc, V. S. Retakh, and J.-Y. Thibon, *Noncommutative symmetric functions*, Advances in Mathematics **112** (1995) 218-348.
[67] I. M. Gelfand and V. S. Retakh, *Determinants of matrices over noncommutative rings*, Functional Analysis and its Applications **25** (1991) 91-102.
[68] J. S. Geronimo, *Scattering theory and matrix orthogonal polynomials on the real line*, Circuits Systems Signal Process **1** (1982) 471-495.
[69] E. Godoy and F. Marcellán, *Orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle: distribution of zeros*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **37** (1991) 195-208.
[70] L. Golinskii, *Schur flows and orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle*, Sbornik Mathematics **197** (2006) 1145.
[71] L. Golinskii and A. Zlatos, *Coefficients of orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle and higher order Szegő theorems*, Constructive Approximation **26** (2007) 361-382.
[72] L. Golinskii and P. Nevai, *Szegő Difference Equations, Transfer Matrices and Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **223**, (2001) 223-259.
[73] F. Grünbaum, M. D. de la Iglesia, and A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, *Properties of matrix orthogonal polynomials via their Riemann–Hilbert characterization*, SIGMA **7** (2011), 098, 31 pages.
[74] E. Hille, *Ordinary Differential Equations in the Complex Domain*, John Wiley& Sons, Inc., New York, 1976.
[75] M. Hisakado, *Unitary matrix models and Painlevé III*, Modern Physics Letters **A11** (1996) 3001–3010.
[76] E. L. Ince, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1956.
[77] M. E. H. Ismail, *Classical and Quantum Orthogonal Polynomials in One Variabl*, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications **98**, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
[78] A. R. Its, *The Riemann–Hilbert Problem and Integrable Systems*, Notices of the AMS **11** (2003) 1389-1400.
[79] A. R. Its, A. B. J. Kuijlaars, and J. Östensson, *Asymptotics for a special solution of the thirty fourth Painlevé equation*, Nonlinearity **22** (2009) 1523–1558.
[80] W. B. Jones and O. Njåstad, *Applications of Szegő polynomials to digital signal processing*, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics **21** (1991) 387-436.
[81] W. B. Jones, O. Njåstad, W. J. Thron, and H. Waadeland, *Szegő polynomials applied to frequency analysis*, Computational and Applied Mathematics **46** (1993) 217-228.
[82] R. Killip and I. Nenciu, *CMV: The unitary analogue of Jacobi matrices*, Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics **60** (2006) 1148-1188.
[83] M. G. Krein, *Infinite J-matrices and a matrix moment problem*, Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR **69** (1949) 125-128.
[84] M. G. Krein, *Fundamental aspects of the representation theory of hermitian operators with deficiency index (m,m)*, American Mathematical Society Translations, Series 2, vol. 97, 75-143, Providence, RI, 1971.
[85] A. B. J. Kuijlaars, A. Martínez-Finkelshtein and F. Wielonsky, *Non-intersecting squared Bessel paths and multiple orthogonal polynomials for modified Bessel weights*, Communications of Mathematical Physics **286** (2009) 217–275.
[86] A. B. J. Kuijlaars, *Multiple orthogonal polynomial ensembles*, in *Recent Trends in Orthogonal Polynomials and Approximation Theory,* Contemporary Mathematics **507**, 155–176, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
[87] A. P. Magnus, *Freud's equations for orthogonal polynomials as discrete Painlevé equations*, in *Symmetries and Integrability of Difference Equations* (Canterbury, 1996), London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series **255**, 228–243, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
[88] K. T.-R. McLaughlin, A. H. Vartanian, and X. Zhou, *Asymptotics of Laurent polynomials of even degree orthogonal with respect to varying exponential weights*, International Mathematical Research Notices **2006** (2006).

[89] K. T.-R. McLaughlin, A. H. Vartanian, and X. Zhou, *Asymptotics of Laurent polynomials of odd degree orthogonal with respect to varying exponential weights*, Constructive Approximation **27** (2008) 149–202.
[90] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, *Szegő polynomials: a view from the Riemann-Hilbert window*, Electronic Transactions in Numerical Analysis **25** (2006) 369-392.
[91] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, K. T.-R. McLaughlin, and E. B. Saff, *Szegő orthogonal polynomials with respect to an analytic weight: canonical representation and strong asymptotics*, Constructive Approximation **24** (2006) 319-363.
[92] H.N. Mhaskar and E. B. Saff, *On the distribution of zeros of polynomials orthogonal on the unit circle*, Journal of Approximation Theory **63** (1990) 30-38.
[93] L. Miranian, *Matrix valued orthogonal polynomials on the real line: some extensions of the classical theory*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **38** (2005) 5731-5749.
[94] L. Miranian, *Matrix Valued Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle: Some Extensions of the Classical Theory*, Canadian Mathematical Bulletin **52** (2009) 95-104.
[95] D. Miličíc, *Lectures on differential equations in complex domains*, http://www.math.utah.edu/ milicic/Eprints/de.pdf.
[96] N. I. Muskhelishvili, *Singular Integral Equations*, Dover, Mineola, NY, 2008.
[97] A. Mukaihira and Y. Nakamura, *Schur flow for orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle and its integrable discretization*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **139** (2002) 75-94.
[98] I. Nenciu, *Lax pairs for the Ablowitz-Ladik system via orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle*, International Mathematics Research Notices **11**, (2005) 647-686.
[99] P. Nevai and V. Totik, *Orthogonal polynomials and their zeros*, Acta Scientiarum Mathematicarum Szeged **53** (1-2) (1989) 99-104.
[100] F. W. Nijhoff and V. G. Papaeorigiou, *Similarity reductions of integrable lattices and discrete analogues of the Painlevé II equation*, Physics Letters **A153** (1991) 337–344.
[101] P. J. Olver, *On Multivariate Interpolation*, Studies in Applied Mathematics **116** (2006) 201-240.
[102] K. Pan, *Asymptotics for Szegő polynomials associated with Wiener–Levinson filters*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **46** (1993) 387-394.
[103] K. Pan and E.B. Saff, *Asymptotics for zeros of Szegő polynomials associated with trigonometric polynomials signals*, Journal of Approximation Theory **71** (1992) 239-251.
[104] V. Periwal and D. Shevitz, *Unitary-Matrix Models as Exactly Solvable String Theories*, Physical Review Letters **64** (1990) 1326-1329.
[105] V. Periwal and D. Shevitz, *Exactly solvable unitary matrix models: multicritical potentials and correlations*, Nuclear Physics **B344** (1990) 731-746.
[106] W. Rudin, *Real and complex analysis*, third edition, McGraw-Hill Book, New York, 1987.
[107] Y. Sibuya, *Linear Differential Equations in the Complex Domain; Problems of Analytic Continuation*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **82**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990.
[108] B. Simon, *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle, Part 1: Classical Theory*, AMS Colloquium Series, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
[109] B. Simon, *Orthogonal Polynomials on the Unit Circle, Part 2: Spectral Theory*, AMS Colloquium Series, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2005.
[110] B. Simon, *CMV matrices: Five years after*, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics **208** (2007) 120-154.
[111] B. Simon, *Zeros of OPUC and long time asymptotics of Schur and related flows*, Inverse Problems Imaging **1** (2007), 189-215.
[112] B. Simon *Szegő's Theorem and its descendants*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2011.
[113] G. Szegő, *Orthogonal Polynomials*, Colloquium Publications **33**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1939.
[114] C. A. Tracy and H. Widom, *Random unitary matrices, permutations and Painlevé*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **207** (1999) 665–685.
[115] W. Van Assche, *Discrete Painlevé equations for recurrence coefficients of orthogonal polynomials*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Difference Equations, Special Functions and Orthogonal Polynomials, 687-725, World Scientific (2007).
[116] W. Wasow, *Asymptotic Expansions for Ordinary Differential Equations*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1965.
[117] D. S. Watkins, *Some perspectives on the eigenvalue problem*, SIAM Review **35** (1993) 430-471.

DEPARTAMENTO DE FÍSICA TEÓRICA II (MÉTODOS MATEMÁTICOS DE LA FÍSICA), FACULTAD DE FÍSICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, PLAZA DE CIENCIAS Nº 1, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN
E-mail address: gaccontra@fis.ucm.es

DEPARTAMENTO DE FÍSICA TEÓRICA II (MÉTODOS MATEMÁTICOS DE LA FÍSICA), FACULTAD DE FÍSICAS, UNIVERSIDAD COMPLUTENSE DE MADRID, PLAZA DE CIENCIAS Nº 1, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, 28040 MADRID, SPAIN
E-mail address: manuel.manas@ucm.es